

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MANY books about the Future have been published since the War began. Two of them are of supreme value, the volume called *Immortality*, edited by Canon STREETER, and the volume with the title of *The World to Come and Final Destiny*, written by the Rev. J. H. LECKIE, D.D., and just published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (10s. net). Both volumes are written by men who have given to this difficult subject special study, and both are written with an easy mastery of the English tongue. The sense of style is perhaps more appreciable in Dr. LECKIE's book, but Canon STREETER and Mr. EMMET, to name only two of the writers of the other, are quite incapable of writing an infelicitous sentence. The two volumes agree also in another and even more momentous matter.

—
Their writers take it for granted that no one will be finally lost. They take it for granted. It has become a settled fact for them and for every one of them. They understand that it has become an assured belief for the generation they live in.

—
Is it the War that has done it? The men who have been killed have been good and bad. They have had the name of God on their tongue, some reverently, some blasphemously. But because they have been taken suddenly, and because they have died for their country, nobody has been able to send them, after death, the one to heaven and the

other to hell. Poet or preacher, there has scarcely been a moment's hesitation in saying of every one of them:

And when He saw his work on earth was done,
He gently called to him, My son, my son,
I need thee for a greater work than this.
Thy faith, thy zeal, thy fine activities
Are worthy of My larger liberties.

Then drew him with the hand of welcoming
grace,
And side by side they climbed the heavenly
ways.

—
But the War has not done it all. For a long time before the War poets had written quite unanimously of their confidence that no one would be finally lost. And before the War preachers had been as unanimous in avoiding texts that seemed to speak of everlasting punishment. The poets are interpreters to men of their own minds. The preachers are interpreters of the mind of God. Both have to adapt their interpretation to the spirit of their time. And both had already recognized that the spirit of their time—not the worldly but the Christian spirit—could not receive the doctrine of everlasting punishment.

—
Now the preacher's difficulty is that that doctrine is in the Bible. It is not in the Bible quite so frequently as it is popularly supposed to be.

There has been debate about the Apostle Paul, but for some time the opinion has been pretty nearly a settled one among scholars that Paul was a universalist. Of the other writers there has never been much dispute. The difficulty is that our Lord Himself seems to have declared the doom of the lost to be for ever. And that difficulty remains.

It remains in one passage. All the other references it seems to be possible to understand without the necessity of finding the doctrine of everlasting punishment in them. It is the passage about the sheep and the goats in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew.

Mr. EMMET in *Immortality* could not get over that passage. He resorted to the startling measure of claiming the right to go beyond Christ. It was credible to Christ that those on His left hand should go away into everlasting punishment prepared for the devil and his angels. It is not credible to us. We must go beyond Christ. How is that in our power? Christ Himself has put it into our power. It is the Spirit of Christ in us that has made it impossible for us to believe in everlasting punishment. Mr. EMMET looks upon it as one of the greater works which He said we should be able to do after (and because) He had gone to the Father.

Dr. LECKIE is just as much arrested by the passage in St. Matthew as Mr. EMMET. But he takes another way with it. He believes that Jesus never uttered the objectionable words.

Dr. LECKIE does not deny the genuineness of the whole passage. He says: 'There is, indeed, no apocalyptic passage in the Gospels that is more certainly interwoven with elements that are characteristic of the Saviour.' But he thinks that it may not be a verbatim report of His words. 'It is an elaborate piece of literary apocalypse, highly allusive, and showing an intimate acquaintance with the Jewish books. It is evidently founded

on the Judgment scene in the *Book of Enoch*, and might almost be reconstructed, so far as its imagery and accessories go, out of the "revelation" literature.'

And as for its closing declaration, 'These shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life,' that, says Dr. LECKIE, 'is probably no part of the parable. It seems to be a comment of the Evangelist or of some later scribe; since it really distracts attention from the main purpose of the passage, which is not to declare the duration of punishment, but to explain the principle of judgment.'

Now both these remedies are somewhat desperate. Are we bound to them? There are two considerations.

The first is that Jesus was a prophet. Now the prophet has nothing to do with time or place. He speaks in the name of God, to whom one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years are as one day, and who is as ready to build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land as in the land of Canaan. When Isaiah represented God as saying, 'Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear,' he did not mean to assert that God answers every prayer the moment it is uttered. He spoke in terms of time, but his thought was of certainty. When the Syro-Phoenician woman came to Jesus with her prayer, He answered her never a word. She prayed again; again He put her off. A third prayer was needed; time was spent; the disciples were becoming annoyed, 'Send her away, she crieth after us.' But the answer to her prayer was absolutely sure from the first. Jesus also, with this example, could say, 'Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear.'

We are quite out of it therefore when we pursue the Greek word *aionios* through all its occurrences to find out whether it means everlasting or not. The idea of time is not in all Christ's thought. I

is the idea of certainty. What He says He says of course in language that will be intelligible to His hearers. What He means to say, that shall be intelligible to us all, is that sin is certainly followed by retribution. He knows the Universe, and He knows the God of the Universe, and He warns those who hear Him that well-doing will assuredly be rewarded and ill-doing as assuredly punished. It is no more, though it is more authoritative, than St. Paul's, 'be not deceived, God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'

That is the first thing. The second is that He was speaking to the religious people of His day. Now we have to realize that our Lord's whole ministry was determined by the fact that society was divided sharply into two classes, the righteous and the sinners; that the righteous counted themselves all right simply because they observed outwardly the precepts of the Mosaic Law, and that they despised the sinners, telling them that there was no hope for them either in this world or in the world to come: 'This people which knoweth not the Law is cursed.'

Jesus set His face against that attitude. He told some of His parables directly to contradict it—the Parable of the Two Sons, the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, the Parable of the Prodigal Son. In the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew we see Him again before those persons who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others, telling them that the principle upon which the judgment of God rested was conduct. And their conduct was discovered by their attitude to these despised sinners. Treat these 'sinners' well, He said, and you will hear God's voice saying, 'Come, ye blessed'; treat them ill and you will receive the due reward of your deeds.

Sometimes He seemed to condemn all the righteous together. 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites.' He does not do so here.

He simply states the principle of God's judgment, and leaves every man to search his own conscience with it. But just as He is speaking *to* the righteous, so is He speaking *of* them. We are therefore entirely out of it again when we apply His language to the sinners. It is the sinners that He is careful for. They are His Brethren. No doubt they are unworthy; but He is careful for the least, the most unworthy of them all. He is sending none of *them* to Gehenna. He is sending those righteous persons there who despise and neglect them.

The foregoing Notes were written, and Phillips Brooks's *Essays and Addresses* was being run through for another purpose, when this passage leaped into sight (it occurs in the Essay on the Teaching of Religion): 'When men cry out against the teaching of an everlasting hell to which they have long listened, nothing could be more mistaken than to try to win their faith by a mere sweeping aside of the whole truth of retribution; nothing could be more futile than to try to make them believe in God by stripping the God we offer them of His divine attributes of judgment and discrimination. But if there comes, as there must come, out of the tumult a deeper sense of the essential, the eternal connection between character and destiny; if men looking deeper into spiritual life are taught to see that the wrath of God and the love of God are not contradictory but the inseparable utterances of the one same nature; if punishment be fastened close to sin as the shadow to the substance, able to go, *certain* to go, where sin can go *and nowhere else*—then the tumult will bring a peace of deeper and completer faith. But surely it will not be easier for a man to believe the new and deep than the old crude doctrine. It will lay an even deeper and more awful burden on his conscience. It will make life more and not less solemn, when men come to see and feel the punishment *in* the sin than when they listened for the threats of punishment as men at sea listen for the breakers on the shore while they are sailing in smooth waters,

which give them no intimation of how far away or near the breakers are.¹

'I believe that if God could end such things as the horror of war and destroy the world's evil to-morrow He would, and that the simple reason why He doesn't is that He can't. I can see nothing else to believe and still keep my sanity and rationality. Can you?'

What are you to do with a man who puts a question like that? You answer him Yes, and you become like him. You answer him No, and you make him wise in his own conceit. We hear of reconstruction after the war. The most urgent form of reconstruction in a case like this is reconstruction of the man himself.

It is Mr. Edmund Henry REEMAN. His book, which has just been published by Messrs. Hurst & Blackett (3s. 6d. net), has a question for title: *Do We Need a New Idea of God?* The answer is, of course, in the affirmative. We are always in need of a new idea of God. It is the duty of every generation to form its own idea of God. If it takes over the idea of some other generation, the idea of God will be of little use to it. Interpretation is the first duty of the teachers of every time. And interpretation means the discovery and delivery of an idea of God that can be received by 'the modern mind.'

Now in our time the modern mind is both a scientific and a democratic mind. And Mr. REEMAN takes full account of both. The scientific mind, he says, has a scientific conception of life which demands a scientific conception of God. And it must be new, wholly new. 'For the simple fact is that between two such absolutely irreconcilable ideas as the newer scientific conception of life and the older theological thought of God there can be no compromise. And since it is impossible logically to believe both, we must choose one or the other.'

¹ Phillips Brooks, *Essays and Addresses*, 50.

The democratic mind also demands a new conception of God. Mr. REEMAN is interested in science; he is much more interested in democracy. If science calls for a reconstruction of the old idea of God, democracy demands an entirely new God. 'The most urgent and stupendous problem for modern theology and religion centres in the one question—Can the thought of God be anyhow reshaped in terms of democratic outreach and in such a manner as to be harmonious therewith and to serve as an interpretation of democracy? Is the conception of a democratic God anyhow possible? And, if so, what sort of a God will it be that such a conception will give us?'

The answer is a God, if it can be called a God, that is purely mechanical or material. Mr. REEMAN calls it a Life-Force. For 'at the core of the universe's life' there exists 'a mighty, mystic power which, to avoid the use of terms that may confuse our thought by their ordinary association, let us call a Life-Force. Throughout all its manifold activities the universe as it is known to the consciousness of man everywhere reveals not only initial impulse, but a continual urge. There is something back of all that we see and know that is for ever pushing things on, and that is everywhere and all the time present. It is the inner essence of all evolving life and the vitality and stability of every law by which life is anywhere and everywhere sustained. It is present in every one of us, and, though we cannot tell for what it may be, it is using us as one medium of its activity. Sometimes it would almost seem, as George Bernard Shaw somewhere says, as if it were taking us by the scruffs of our little necks and compelling and coercing us in spite of ourselves to serve its tasks and purposes. It is this Life-Force in man that has made him what he is, and all that he is. Not only are we identified with this Life-Force in the most vital sense and altogether dependent upon it, but in a profoundly true sense WE ARE THE LIFE-FORCE OPERATING IN A CERTAIN DIRECTION.'

The capital letters with which that paragraph

ends are Mr. REEMAN'S. And the sentence deserves capital letters. For this is Mr. REEMAN'S God. It is evident that what we need is not a new idea of God, but a new God. But what has this new God to do with democracy? Mr. REEMAN answers, Everything. He *is* democracy. 'So then'—these are his words—"it becomes no less true to say that God is democracy than to say that God is love, since in the realm of social consciousness democracy represents a development no less definite and important than that which love represents in the realm of ethical qualities."

That sentence shows us where we are. Mr. REEMAN wants a God who is scientific and democratic; he is not looking for a God who is ethical. Science and democracy together make up progress, and progress is Mr. REEMAN'S name for human welfare. The Christian God is a God of love, and Mr. REEMAN has no place for Him. He does find room for good-will between man and man, 'a generous good-will'; but it is the outcome, not of the ethical choice of love, but of the urge of the Life-Force which he can neither obey nor disobey, but simply run on before.

And now also we see why Mr. REEMAN is dissatisfied with 'the old idea of God.' He has discovered that it is made up of three conceptions—sin, salvation, and judgment. If it is, then certainly to science and democracy, without ethics, it is a most inadequate combination. It is even offensive. For it is quite possible that the thought of sin, salvation, and judgment will stand in the way of progress, whether scientific or democratic, or both.

The book just noticed is worth the notice it has received. For if there is one word more than another which has captivated the minds of men at the present moment it is the word 'Democracy.' And that book, as clearly as any book we have seen, utters a warning significantly.

It is not a warning against Democracy. That

would have been foolish if in time, it would be futile now because too late. Democracy has come. Says the Rev. G. A. Studdert KENNEDY, in his book *The Hardest Part* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net): 'I was driven to this truth about the British soldier by my wanderings as a preacher throughout the bases and the armies in the field, and I was driven against my will, for, in many ways, the prospect frightens me.'

What is the truth? That the one and only subject the British soldier is interested in, the one and only thing he has been anxiously fighting for, is Democracy. 'Everywhere I find among the men of the army that this is the one great thing that touches them and rouses real enthusiasm. They do believe in Democracy.' Those are Mr. KENNEDY'S words.

Does it mean that the British soldiers are republicans? It does not mean that. The British soldier, and his British chaplain, can be thrilled by the singing of the National Anthem. 'I never was thrilled by "God save the King" before. As a rule it leaves me cold; to-day it sent a tingling down my spine and gave me a lump in my throat. I wonder why. I suppose I am a bit upset really; hell is bad for the nerves. The parade was pretty awful too, so many splendid chaps absentees; it gets on one's nerves. I suppose I am a bit windy. We are all in for it again the day after to-morrow, and there will be more absentees. "The King" sounded so dauntless and determined. It seemed like the song of a thousand martyrs on their road to death. *Morituri te salutamus* business, only in a nobler cause. It thrilled one like a great confession of faith.'

It is not a matter of politics at all. It is a matter of individuality. It is the offspring of the new sense of the worth of every single human being. And the remarkable circumstance is that this sense has arisen on the battlefield where the individual life is seemingly of so little account.



But it is doubtful if the battlefield does give a man the impression that the individual life is of little account. He sees men fall in great numbers; he takes part in the wholesale slaughter. But none of these things makes him think his own life of little account. It is because his life is dear to him that he sells it at the highest price in his power. And then the battlefield makes him think.

That is the secret. The war has compelled the men who have been in it to think, and to think in close relation to themselves. It has made them ask why they are there. It has driven them to find an answer, and to find it at once. And the answer is that they have determined to make it impossible for one man, however exalted, ever again to make war on his own responsibility. It has made them resolve that, as far as in them lies, every man shall henceforth have a right to a voice in the government of his country. 'This conviction,' says Mr. KENNEDY, 'is the only one of an ultimate kind that I find common and intense throughout the British Army. If they have any religion, it is centred in this idea of Democratic Freedom. This is their faith, vague and shadowy, but enormously powerful and big with mighty issues, good and evil, for the days that are to come.'

'Big with mighty issues, good and evil.' Yes, that is the point. Democracy is not all good or inevitably good. Mr. REEMAN's book has made that clear enough to be seen and read of all men. It is very clear to Bishop GORE for one.

Bishop GORE has been delivering his visitation addresses, and now he publishes them along with some other pertinent papers in a volume with the title of *Dominant Ideas and Corrective Principles* (Mowbray; 3s. 6d. net). In the very first address he says that there are three great ideas now dominant, and these three ideas are comprehended under the one word 'Democracy.'

There is first the idea of the equal worth of

every individual person. It means 'that every human person counts for one, and no one counts for more than one; that nothing can justify the misusing of any person in the interest of another man's profit or pleasure; that every one born into the world has a divine right to the opportunity of making the best of himself or herself and doing the best service of which he is capable.'

Next, there is the idea that the welfare of the community should be supreme over the profit of the individual. 'The individual cannot be allowed to "do what he will with his own," if he is thereby damaging the common life.' The basis of society must be brotherhood and mutual service.

Thirdly, just as 'the interest of the community shall be dominant over the individual and family, so the interest of the whole group of nations must be made effectively supreme over the ambition of any one.' 'While the war has intensified patriotism, it has also made us feel afresh what an intensely dangerous virtue patriotism is. It becomes so easily corporate selfishness and lust of domination. Germany is before our eyes as an example of the false exclusive patriotism which threatens the welfare and liberty of every other nation. This is why we feel that we are fighting against Germany for what is vital, and must fight on till the militarist ambition of Germany is discredited and defeated.'

These are the great ideas which the war has thrown up. They may be comprehended, we say, under the one word 'Democracy.' So far as the soldier or the civilian has thought out what Democracy means to him, it means these three, 'the idea of the equal right of every person to the opportunities of the best life; the idea of the welfare of the community as supreme over the selfish self-aggrandisement of the individual: the idea of the fellowship of nations as supreme over the ambition of each by itself.'

Now these ideas are not contrary to Christianity.

They are Christianity at work in its ethical and social relationships. And the duty that lies before the Church is not to denounce Democracy, but to direct it into the right channels, remembering that, in Mr. Studdert KENNEDY's words, it is 'enormously powerful and big with mighty issues, good and evil, for the days that are to come.'

It is not impossible. For the Bishop of Oxford asserts, and he is right in asserting, that men are not turning away from Christ, but rather turning to Christ as the prophet of the true humanity. The men, he says, who have discovered Democracy, have discovered also that all that it rightly covers is to be found in Christ. And he says they are turning upon the Church and demanding, 'Why have you left us to find all this out from more or less alien sources, as if it were no part of the Christian religion? Why have you left it to men who do not belong to the Church to re-discover these truths? Why have you professed followers of Jesus Christ been so stupidly acquiescent in just those very evils which, in the name of your Master, you ought to have been denouncing? Why have you not stood up for justice—stood up for the oppressed and underpaid and underfed and ill-housed? Why have you not been scandalized by the extremes of wealth and poverty? Why did you acquiesce in a false philosophy, manifestly anti-Christian? Why have you been satisfied with a national Christianity, and forgotten your supernatural society?'

These things are all in Christ, and only in Christ can they be made powerful for good. Christianity 'has said that all men are meant for liberty, but that they will never really be free save through the redeeming power of Christ and of His Spirit. "If the Son maketh you free, ye shall be free indeed." "Where the Spirit is Lord, there is liberty." Or again, it has said that all men are meant for brotherhood, but that it is only in Christ that real brotherhood can be established. Once more Christianity declares that the purpose of God can only be realized in a fellowship of all

mankind; but it also recognizes how deep in fallen human nature is the narrowness and exclusiveness of a false patriotism, and how thorough a change of heart is needed if men are to recognize real fellowship with those of other races.'

And so we discover the danger of Democracy. If it insists on its rights and forgets its responsibilities, its power will certainly be for evil. And there is no way of preventing that catastrophe other than the way which was pointed out by Christ Himself. 'History has proved abundantly that our Lord was a profoundly true prophet when He told men that they needed personal redemption as the means to social salvation, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see, or enter, the kingdom of God." And Christianity in its earliest history did really vindicate its claim to show the way to a true humanity. The Church did appear as a real brotherhood, which showed its capacity to be world-wide, and really enabled men to feel themselves free and spiritually equal, bound together in a fellowship of mutual service. It did this, not because it was primarily humanitarian, but because it put God first and believed in Jesus Christ as Lord and Son of God, and set itself to live by His teaching, and kept its standard of membership high and searching.'

Are we entitled to speak of a Soldier's Gospel? St. Paul spoke of a Gospel which he called his own: is the soldier entitled to his own Gospel? Dr. W. J. DAWSON counts him entitled. In that surprising book called *The Father of a Soldier* (Lane; 4s. net), there is, he says, 'a Gospel of the Trenches.' It is the soldier's Gospel, and Dr. DAWSON says the soldier has won his title to it.

The Gospel of the Trenches contains two doctrines. The first doctrine is that there is a life beyond death. Dr. DAWSON puts that doctrine second, but logically and systematically it comes first. There is a life beyond death. Dr. DAWSON himself has just discovered it.

Dr. DAWSON has been a preacher of the Gospel for some thirty or forty years, yet he has just made this discovery. It is, of course, a traditional belief. It is an inseparable part of Christianity. But like most traditional beliefs it has little real vitality. It has no firm grip upon the mind. 'I know,' says Dr. DAWSON, 'how little real vitality it has had for me by the pains which I have taken to maintain it. I have buttressed it by all sorts of vulnerable analogies drawn from nature, by the chance words of science, by the assertions of poets, by the rare conviction that visits the mind when a great man disappears from the theatre of action, that the qualities of his mind and character cannot be utterly extinguished. But the doubt remains, and for one analogy that points to the survival of human personality a hundred suggest its extinction. It is probable that most intellectual men who have a real interest in religion, in their secret thoughts, never move far beyond the dying declaration of John Sterling, that he anticipated death with much of hope, and no fear.'

But to Dr. DAWSON the life beyond death has become a real belief to-day. It is 'strong enough to stand firm without the vain buttresses of precarious analogies.' How has he gained it? 'I have learned it from no theologian; I have been persuaded to it by no elaborate argument; it is the natural deduction drawn from the grim but splendid facts of war. It is the soldier's faith.'

Letters had been coming from his son who was a soldier in the trenches. In all the letters this truth is assumed. For 'the soldier sees his comrade, who yesterday was a sentient, thinking, foreseeing creature, smashed into pulp by an explosive shell. His body has disappeared so completely that only a handful of pitiful fragments remain to witness that it once existed. He is no philosopher, but some inward voice assures him that this handful of battered clay is not his comrade. He speaks of him as not dead, but as "gone west." The west for him represents all that was most precious in life—the prairie farm, the ranch house in its

orchards, the child, the wife, the home he loved and toiled for—so he has "gone west."

'The phrase is not to be analysed, but its implication is clear—the body scattered in the mire of Flanders is not the man. The man has passed on, and taken with him all that composed his personality, his gaiety and courage, his unselfishness and heroism, and all the "endearing blend of his faults and virtues." The tragic ease with which the body vanishes from sight conveys the sense of something unreal in his disappearance. So, in his simple way, not arguing the matter or being capable of argument, the soldier assumes human immortality as a necessity of thought.'

'He could not go on with the work of war without it. He could not believe in God unless he believed that the spirit of a man returned to God when the red earth received the poor remnants of the broken body. He stands upon a field covered with the dead, and hears his Commander say, "As regards our comrades who have lost their lives—let us speak of them with our caps off—my faith in the Almighty is such that I am perfectly sure that when men die, doing their duty and fighting for their country . . . no matter what their past lives have been, no matter what they have done that they ought not to have done (as all of us do), I am perfectly sure that the Almighty takes them and looks after them at once.' Lads, we cannot leave them better than like that." He hears the brave message, and he accepts it as a vital gospel; and the words which he may have heard many times as an idle boast become to him a trumpet sounding over these fields of inhuman slaughter, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?"'

The second doctrine of the Soldier's Gospel is the belief that the life beyond death is the reward of his heroism in this life.

That doctrine is not so traditional as the other. It is not quite so undeniable a part of Christianity.

Is there not something of a surprise in the vigorous assertion of it by so ardent an evangelical, and so successful an evangelist, as Dr. W. J. DAWSON? It is a new discovery also. Unlike the doctrine of the future life, he had not even believed that he believed in it before. He is thoroughly and joyfully convinced of it now.

And the first effect of it is to give him a new conception of Christ. He says: 'I find I have been deceived by the stress laid upon His meekness and His lowliness; even by the emphasis put upon His loving-kindness. These qualities have been interpreted to me as amiability. But I see now that Christ was not an amiable person, for amiability is weakness. An amiable Christ would never have given deliberate offence to the rulers of His nation, and would not have been crucified. He would never have insisted on men forsaking all whom they loved to follow Him; He would have been too tender-hearted. There was a sternness in His character which made Him terrible. He was against all soft and selfish modes of life. He could be pitiful toward error, but He had no mercy on complacent ease and deliberate cowardice. The whole impact of His life and teaching was to create heroes, and He did create them out of the most unpromising material.'

The Gospel of Heroism is thus the Gospel of Christ. And the soldiers have it. They do not claim it, certainly. They do not themselves call it so. 'They are unconscious of their own heroism. If we met them they would not remind us in the least of saints and apostles. They have faults, and some of them have vices. Their virtues they are accustomed to disguise; they would count it immodest to display them. But the

virtue is there, that supreme virtue of self-surrender to which Christianity itself makes its appeal, in response to which men exceed their own natures, and become the true supermen of the realms of the spirit.'

They do not claim the heroism, and they do not call for the reward of it. They simply take the reward for granted. 'A friend has just left my house whose boy has been home on his last leave before going overseas. He is only eighteen, and young for his age. He has been trying to enlist ever since his seventeenth birthday. He succeeded at last, and joined by choice a branch of the service which is generally regarded as the most dangerous. Speaking of him, his father said, "Of course he expects to die. They all do." The words were uttered calmly, as though they expressed a commonplace!'

'How does a boy of eighteen arrive at such a thought? There is only one way—the profound conviction that death is not the great disaster which a comfortable civilization supposes it to be. Years do not make a life. Deeds afford the only authentic measurement of life. Life is a quality of the spirit over which death has no power. There is no greater victory possible to the spirit of a man than the temper which ignores death at the call of duty. This boy of eighteen has won that victory. All these men of whom my son writes have won it, won it so completely that when volunteers are asked for some perilous service, from which it is certain only one or two can return, the difficulty is not to find volunteers but to restrain the men who jostle and outbid one another in the effort to secure the chance of dying.'

What I Believe in and Why.

II.

I Believe in the Sinner.

It is easier to believe in the Sinner than in the Saint.

Our Lord found it easier. In His day on earth society was divided sharply into the two classes. As the two classes covered the whole of the people there was much variety of character in each class. Some of the Sinners were very sinful, others less; and some of the Saints were truly saintly, others not at all. But on the whole He found it easier to believe in the Sinners than in the Saints.

It is birth or wealth that makes the distinction between classes in our day, but in Christ's day the Saints and the Sinners were not distinguished so. More remarkable than that, they were not distinguished by character. A Sinner might be a man of excellent moral character, and a Saint might be a man of known and notorious vileness. The difference between them was due to the Law of Moses. Those who 'knew' the Law were Saints; those who knew it not were Sinners. It was not a question of goodness or badness, but of observance or non-observance of the precepts of the Law. The name given to those who knew the Law was therefore not Saints but Righteous, and the two classes were known as 'the Righteous' and 'the Sinners.'

Jesus showed in many ways that He found it easier to believe in the Sinners than in the Righteous. He told the story of two men who went up to the Temple to pray. One was a Pharisee, that is, he was a Righteous man; the other was a Publican, and therefore one of the Sinners. And after repeating the words of their prayers, He said emphatically, 'I tell you, this man (the Publican) went down to his house justified (that is, counted righteous before God) rather than the other.'

We also find it easier to believe in the Sinner than in the Saint. And the reason is the same. The Saint is often not really a Saint, while the Sinner is always a Sinner. We know where we are with Sinners; we do not know where we are with Saints. There are Sinners of every degree of sinfulness, but they are all Sinners. There are Saints who, so far as we can judge, have no title to the name. If we used the word Saint as St. Paul did,

it would be different. By 'Saint' St. Paul meant one who believed in Christ to the forgiveness of his sins, and so was *on the way* to true holiness. But by 'Saint' we mean one who has attained (or professes to have attained) to holiness. Thus the reason why we find it easier to believe in the Sinner than in the Saint is that if the Saint is not a Saint he has first to acknowledge himself a Sinner and then begin to be a Saint; whereas the Sinner is a Sinner, there is no doubt about that, and can begin to be a Saint at once.

In a word, I believe in the Sinner because it is possible to make him a Saint.

But I have other two reasons, and I wish to take the three reasons in order.

I.

I believe in the Sinner *because God believes in him*. How do I know that God believes in the Sinner? Because of the extraordinary interest He takes in every single individual.

We speak of God's works as the works of creation and providence. What an interest God takes in the creation of every person. He does not make two alike. There is no standardizing in God's workshop. Every one of His creatures has individuality. He is himself. God is not a machine, making other machines with undeviating sameness. He is a sculptor whose loving hand traces every curve and line and never gives His mallet the same tap twice.

'As like as a Hand to another Hand!'

Whoever said that foolish thing,
Could not have studied to understand

The counsels of God in fashioning,
Out of the infinite love of his heart,
This Hand, whose beauty I praise, apart
From the world of wonder left to praise
If I tried to learn the other ways
Of love in its skill, or love in its power.

But God's creative care for the individual is not greater than His providential care. Tennyson said:

So careful of the type He seems,
So careless of the single life.

and in saying so he said just as foolish a thing as a man who said, 'As like as a Hand to another Hand.' Augustine knew better: 'Lord, when I look upon mine own life it seems Thou hast led me so carefully, so tenderly, Thou canst have attended to none else; but when I see how wonderfully Thou hast led the world and art leading it, I am amazed that Thou hast had time to attend to such as I.'

Now most of the individuals for whom God cares are sinners, and He does not care less for them on that account. It is one of the miscalculations of the Saint to think that God's love for Saints is greater than His love for Sinners. It is a different kind of love. 'If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' That is a different kind of love from the love of God to the Sinner, when God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son. But it is not greater. How could any love be greater than that? God cares for Sinners as much as He cares for Saints. For He wants to make them Saints, and the way to make Sinners Saints is to care for them. You remember Christina Rossetti?

And when he marked me, downcast utterly,
Where foul I sat and faint,
Then more than ever Christ-like kindled he;
And welcomed me as I had been a saint,
Tenderly stooping low to comfort me.

That is the way of the Saint, the true Saint, with the Sinner. That is God's way.

The whole of His care is directed to the making of Sinners into Saints. Whittier has a familiar verse:

There is no place where earth's sorrows
Are more felt than up in heaven,
There is no place where earth's failings
Have such kindly judgment given.

That is right; but it is not quite right. God's care is not indulgence towards the sinner's failings. It is not kindly judgment; it is careful discipline. Not a failing is left unheeded. Kindly is He in all His ways, but also firm. 'Thou, O Lord, art a God full of compassion and gracious, longsuffering, and plenteous in mercy and truth.' Yes, in mercy and truth. And 'truth' to the Psalmist meant firmness. Whittier is sure about the mercy, He is not so sure about the truth.

The great thing to know is, that God means to make of the Sinner a Saint, that He has faith in him, and that He directs all His providential care to that end.

Because of Thy strong faith, I kept the track
Whose sharp set stones my strength had well-nigh spent;
I could not meet Thy eyes if I turned back;
So on I went.

Because Thou wouldst not yield belief in me,
The threatening crags that rose my way to bar
I conquered inch by crumbling inch—to see
The goal afar.

And though I struggle toward it through hard years,
Or flinch, or falter blindly, yet within,
'You can,' unwaveringly my spirit hears,
And I shall win.

II.

I believe in the Sinner *because Christ believes in him*. How do I know that Christ believes in the Sinner? He came to give His life a ransom for sinners. That historical fact is not made much of at present, but there is something in it.

There is something in it, whatever you think of Christ. You cannot think less of Him than that He was great and good. Now when a great and good man tells you what is his aim, and when he pursues that aim at the risk of losing his life, when he actually does lose his life in the pursuit of it, you must be persuaded that there is something in it. But if you believe, as I do, that God sent His Son into the world for this very purpose, that He might give His life a ransom for sinners, you must believe that there is more in it than in any other fact in history.

He came to give His life a ransom for Sinners. That means a definite purpose on God's part. And as God is very old as well as very young, it is a purpose that was formed not yesterday, but in eternity. This is one of the discoveries of the Apostle Paul, and he was never done wondering at it. Especially as he always looked upon himself as a Sinner. 'He (God) hath chosen us (sinners) in him (Christ) before the foundation of the world.' So when the fulness of the time was come God sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law.

He came for Sinners. He came to make them Saints. Hear the Apostle to the Gentiles again: 'that we should be holy' (a perfect description of the Saint). To believe in Sinners is to believe that they may become Saints. It is not easy when we see them as Sinners and think what it means to be a Saint. But it is easier when we remember that purpose of God, formed in eternity, formed deliberately and determinedly. And it becomes easier still when we remember that Christ died for Sinners to make them Saints. For now we have not only God's eternal purpose, which is not likely to be thwarted, but also Christ's self-sacrificing love, the most piercing fact of the most powerful force in the Universe. Will the Sinner resist for ever the pressure of God's purpose? Will he withstand for ever the melting force of the fire of Christ's love?

But he must have a chance. There are two ways in which a Sinner must be given a chance—first as a human being, and then as an individual. The first is given by Christ, the second by the Saint.

There was a time when a man had no chance on account of the derangement of the Universe. The Sinner's sin had thrown all the moral machinery of the Universe out of gear. For man is not merely a number of individuals; there is humanity as well as men. Every act of every man thrills through the being of all other men. And the very first act of sin sent its influence throughout every part of the human race, and even up and down through the wide Universe of God's creation. Jesus came to readjust things. He became a man and sent His perfect manhood into the race to restore the harmony in every part and to bring it back to God. He died to reconcile us to God and to one another; and since then, so far as the Universe is concerned, the Sinner has the chance of becoming a Saint. One thing only remains. Every individual Sinner must be brought face to face with the purpose of God, and heart to heart with the love of Christ. He must get a chance. That is what the Saint has to do for the Sinner.

III.

I believe in the Sinner *because the Saint believes in him.* How do I know that the Saint believes in him? Because that is one of the marks of a Saint. The man who does not believe in Sinners is not himself a Saint. And also because the

Saints now everywhere are coming to see that the Sinner must get a chance.

Christ removed the hindrance in the Universe. We must remove the hindrance in society. That is what the Saints everywhere are coming to see. That is what the Saints everywhere are beginning to do. There is an article in *THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* on 'Prisons.' It is written by Lord Guthrie, Senator of the College of Justice in Scotland. This is how that article ends: 'If the State does its duty in these essential particulars, the Christian Church will not be slow to avail itself of the opportunity, which it has never yet had of bringing to bear the power of the gospel of Christ without the hindrances and pitfalls which at present, to so large an extent, render nugatory the best efforts of religion and philanthropy. The present generation will not see it; but the day will come when no member of any civilized community will be able to say to any judge what a criminal, young in years but old in crime, once truthfully said, before sentence, to the writer of this article, "My lord, I never had a chance!"' There is a commentary on these words in Lord Tollemache's *Talks with Mr. Gladstone*. After 'expressing a doubt whether Madame de Staël meant her *mot* (Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner) to be taken quite literally, Mr. Gladstone went on to say: "I will go the length of admitting that, even in the extreme case of pronouncing the sentence of death, a judge, if he is really a Christian man, will be liable to say to himself, 'God knows how much that man has been tempted, and though for the sake of society I am bound to punish him, he may on the Judgment Day be preferred before me.'"

There are many kinds of Sinners. It is the duty of the Saint to give every one of them a chance—to believe in them, to see the possibilities of Saintliness in them, and to give them a chance.

1. I believe in the worldly-minded Sinner. The most familiar example is Zacchæus. Money and position are everything. Zacchæus got the money 'by false accusation,' but could not obtain the social position. He came into touch with Christ. Then—'To-day is salvation come to this house, forso much as he also is a son of Abraham' (who was a son of God—see the genealogy). The case is typical and quite conclusive.

2. I believe in the reckless, rowdy Sinner. He has come before us frequently during the War. And we have found it easy to believe in him because of his courage and his patriotism. This example is related by Dr. William Ewing in his book *From Gallipoli to Baghdad*: 'A burly Irishman came in with many wounds. His case was quite hopeless. Even so, he could appreciate the humour of his appearance. "What are you?" asked the doctor kindly. "Sure, I'm half an Irishman." "And what's the other half?" "Holes and bandages," came the answer like a flash. They gave him morphia to soothe him, without much effect. Soon the ward was filled with a rich, mellow voice, singing—what think you?—

Rule Britannia, Britannia rules the waves.
Britains never, never, NEVER shall be slaves.

With the echo of that patriotic song on his lips he went down into the dark valley.'

Where God is. God with His eternal purpose.
Where also is Christ, Christ with His everlasting love.

3. I believe in the Sinner who is a Savage. Can saints be made out of Savages? It is the missionary's absorbing purpose. And sometimes it is so well done, that we are ashamed of our own sanctity. As for the possibility, listen to Bishop Gilbert White in *Round about the Torres Straits* (1917): 'It is my deliberate opinion that the aboriginals at Yarrabah have shown themselves as capable of those qualities of discipline, unselfishness, self-restraint, and fixity of purpose which go to make up civilized social life as any other race.' Then the Bishop tells this story: 'I attended an interesting ceremony in the drawing-room of Government House, Darwin, on the occasion of the presentation by the Administrator of the Albert Medal, conferred by the King on an aboriginal called Neighbour for conspicuous bravery. Neighbour was one of the men whom we met on the occasion of our first visit to the Roper, and he was afterwards arrested by a mounted constable on the charge of stealing cattle. It is not at all necessary to suppose that he had been personally guilty of the offence, as it is not infrequently the custom to consider any member of a tribe responsible for any act committed by another member, if the first is available and the second not easily got at. The prisoner was in chains when he arrived with the

constable on the bank of a flooded river. The constable rode into the water to see if it were crossable, leaving his prisoner on the bank, when in swimming his horse rolled over, striking him on the head with his hoof, and he was washed down the middle of the stream quite unconscious. Neighbour, chained as he was, sprang into the water, swam out to the drowning man, and brought him safely to the bank. He then caught the constable's horse, and might easily have been a hundred miles away before any alarm could have been given. Instead of this, he rode in to the Police Station, about twenty miles away, and brought help for his captor. It is pleasing to be able to record that the constable in this instance showed his gratitude by settling a sum of money for life upon his rescuer. All the Government officials of Darwin were present, as well as the Bishop of the diocese, when the Administrator, in the King's name, presented the medal to the first pure-blooded Australian aboriginal to receive this decoration.'

4. I believe in the Sinner who is a Criminal. How easy that is to-day! We realize our relationship to the criminal as our fathers never did. We see the social, the moral, the economic factors which produce him, and we know that for these factors we cannot escape our share of responsibility. The criminal problem, as an experienced writer has it, is not so much a penal as a social problem. If Sir Edward Clarke is to be believed, the late Justice Hawkins was no sentimentalist, yet in his *Reminiscences* he again and again lets us see that in his opinion our present criminal laws do not give the criminal a chance. They take account neither of heredity, nor of upbringing, nor of temptation. But we are on the way to better manners and better laws. There is a well-attested story of a young girl who was repeatedly punished for stealing flowers. Then it occurred to some Saint that this sin might be diverted into (social) sanctity. She was given a flower-stall in Paris, and her infamy was turned into honour.

5. I believe in the Sinner who is a Prostitute. On that sin also we are coming nearer to the mind of Christ. First of all we dismiss the plea of necessity. 'It is a time-honoured lie,' says Professor James Stuart of Cambridge, 'that men have irresistible passions, and that women must be sacrificed to them, and unless I believed it to be a

lie of the deepest dye I should believe God to be unjust and should fall into despair. But it *is* a lie, and I shall never cease to endeavour to expose it. It is a lie which of all the lies which circulate in the world just now has, I believe, most of deadly poison in, it against religion and against God.'

And there are examples. One of the most touching occurs in the *Life of Francis Thompson*. The girl noticed his forlorn state as he tramped the streets of London and slept under its bridges, and she did all in her power to assist him. 'When the streets were no longer crowded with shameful possibilities she would think of the only tryst that her heart regarded and, a sister of charity, would take her beggar into her vehicle at the appointed place and cherish him with an affection maidenly and motherly, and passionate in both these capacities. Two outcasts, they sat marvelling that there were joys for them to unbury and to share. Weakness and confidence, humility and reverence, were gifts unknown to her except at his hands, and she repaid them with graces as lovely as a child's, and as unhesitating as a saint's.' And when he found friends and fame she kept away; he never saw her again.

I waited the inevitable last.

Then there came past

A child; like thee, a spring-flower; but a flower
Fallen from the budded coronal of Spring,
And through the city-streets blown withering.
She passed,—O brave, sad, loveliest, tender
thing!

And of her own scant pittance did she give,

That I might eat and live:

Then fled, a swift and trackless fugitive.

6. I believe in the Drunkard. This is a harder belief than those that have been named. One day in the City a mass of men and women, drunkards all, were gathered in a mission room. It was packed, for a feast was to be had for nothing. The missionary spoke to them. They belonged to the district; would they not come to the Mission church? They assented unanimously, uproariously. Next night the Mission church was opened. Not one was there. 'The wood's rotten,' said the Superintendent, 'the nails will not hold.' Yet it is possible to make a Saint even of the Sinner who is a drunkard. There are examples. But listen again to Lord Guthrie. If the drunkard is to be

won for the Kingdom, the State must step in and see that, 'whether or not, in the interests of personal, social, and national efficiency, the sale of alcohol, like the sale of opium, should be prohibited except for medicinal use, the existing temptations to use alcohol either in moderation or in excess—such temptations being often found at the maximum where the power of resistance is at the minimum—shall be ended.'

7. I believe in the Sinner who is a Pharisee. That is the hardest belief of all. There are two kinds of Pharisees.

First there is the Pharisee who is too religious to be righteous. He is much occupied with salvation, but it is only the saving of his own soul. He believes in the Perseverance of the Saints. He is strong on doctrine, especially the doctrine of Justification by Faith. The texts that should be chosen for sermons are evangelical texts. If any other is chosen he is offended. Martin of Oban once chose the words of Micah: 'What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.' 'If there's an awkward text in all the Bible,' said a godly hearer, 'that man is sure to find it.'

Next there is the Pharisee who is too righteous to be religious. He does not go to church; only hypocrites do. When he comes upon a life in which religion is an evident influence he calls it 'religiosity.' Even Viscount Morley calls it so—'intense religiosity (what is the word?)'—though he admits that the reading of a pious woman's memoir made him think,—'in one way made me as remorseful as Atys in Catullus. But that cannot be helped.'

These two—the Pharisee who is too religious to be righteous, and the Pharisee who is too righteous to be religious—are the most difficult of all Sinners to make Saints of. For the first and last essential is absent, the recognition of sinfulness. That is why the Publicans and Harlots enter the Kingdom sooner. Yet I believe in the Sinner who is a Pharisee. For it is part of my creed that with God nothing is impossible. And there have been examples even here. Do they not say that the rich young ruler became the disciple whom Jesus loved? And in our own day we have had of the other kind one outstanding example—George Romanes.

Literature.

CONSTANTINE.

It is not Constantine the Great. It is that Constantine who was once the idol of the Greek people, and is now discredited and in exile. When things began to go wrong between him and Venizelos, it came into the head of a Greek woman, who was living with her husband in America, that her duty was to go to Greece and reconcile these two. Accordingly—her name on the book is Demetra Vaka, and the name of her husband, who went with her, is Kenneth Brown—she sailed for Europe, saw Mr. Lloyd George and other men on the way, and, reaching Greece, interviewed King Constantine, Venizelos, and all the great men on both sides. Then she returned and wrote this book, which she calls *Constantine: King and Traitor* (John Lane; 12s. 6d. net).

The title tells its story. The visit to Greece was a disillusionment. She believed in Constantine until he himself dispelled the belief. The interviews with him are told in the first person, and with extraordinary skill. Did these interviews really take place? The vivid narrative, its individuality, and its consistency, drive doubt away. Every man is himself and he is always himself. And every woman is herself also.

Beside the vivid narrative there are photographs of the men whose names were once so familiar to us—not of Constantine and Venizelos only, but of Streit, Gounaris, Zaïmis, Coundouriotis, and all the rest.

REALISM.

'Within the last few years it has become less fashionable to talk of ideals in discussions about art and life. The ideals themselves have not perished—indeed, experience seems to show that the fact which they express is a singularly living one—but we prefer to call them by another name. Where some time ago people would have spoken of ideals as a matter of course, they now talk of values. The change is not to be dismissed at once as a fad or a mere bit of slang or preciousness, for we find it among the gravest philosophers. It does really express a change of attitude towards the things which matter most to us. It is part of

the movement towards realization and satisfaction, characteristic of our way of looking at life, our literature, and our thought.'

It is this movement towards realization and satisfaction that Mr. Arthur McDowall, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, describes and commends in his book entitled *Realism: A Study in Art and Thought* (Constable; 10s. 6d. net). He has nothing to say against ideals or idealism. We have always had, we shall always have, our ideals, even those that we scarcely hope to realize—though that may be in the region of faith rather than of philosophy. But for the moment it is the practical value of our ideals that concerns most of our thinkers and also our artists, whether the artists are poets, painters, sculptors, or even musicians. 'People are not different because they talk about values, but they talk about values because they have changed their point of view. The essential difference has been hinted at already; there is a franker movement to define real needs and choices, and to fulfil them. Although ideals and values can be used as if they were interchangeable terms, standing for just the same ethical, æsthetic, or religious experiences, the form which they give to these experiences is not in fact the same. Ideals are above all a creation of the mind, pointing to the best which can be imagined as possible in any sphere. Values are the expression of states of feeling which are actual. While the tendency of ideals is to

'Fix perfect homes in the unsubstantial sky,
And say, what is not, shall be bye-and-bye,'

values aim at a good for which the materials are present. It is hard to press the point without seeming unfair to ideals; still, you may conceive an ideal perfection and regard it coldly; but it becomes a value if it embodies what you really feel. The man whose ideals do embody his real feelings will have no inclination to adopt this language. But it is against the abuse of ideals that the argument for values is directed; and in this sense it suggests a return to fact, to the capacities we are actually endowed with and the conditions which invite us to realise them.'

The source of this preference for values is in the strong insistence laid in our day upon Reality.

What Reality is—that is another matter. As Viscount Morley said of a Conservative, 'I cannot define him, but I know him when I see him'; we know Reality when we see it, whether it is in a painting, a poem, or a sermon. We insist upon having it. And it is Realism that lets us have it.

But Realism is not Naturalism. The work of Zola is Naturalism; the work of Flaubert or Tolstoy or Gorki is Realism; and there is an essential difference. 'Both types aim at representing what exists; but naturalism insists that this should be cut to a certain pattern, while realism is, or should be, prepared for all its possible manifestations.' More clearly: Realism is 'a form of art which represents the actual world in such a way as to give a heightened sense of it; an impersonal art, subduing idiosyncrasy to the theme it works on, and yet having, when it is successful, that individual accent by which great art is known.'

BISMARCK.

To the series entitled 'Makers of the Nineteenth Century,' edited by Basil Williams, has been added *Bismarck*, by C. Grant Robertson, M.A., C.V.O., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford (Constable; ros. 6d. net). No biographical series of our time has obtained a higher reputation, and it will lose none of it through this volume.

Mr. Robertson has a distinction of style which does not captivate at once but which carries one away at last. We stumble at first over sentences with so pronounced an individuality as this: 'His health gave way, and in June he was seriously ill. His case was mismanaged, and for some days he sat on Charon's pier, wondering whether he would be called on to cross to the other side.' Or this: 'The psychology of the statecraft of power reveals one simple categorical imperative of state-reason: never let others do to you what you would do to them, and it is one of the supreme penalties of that statecraft, imposed on its disciples, invariably to expect foul play as the riposte to foul play.' But we are brought into line by the overpowering discovery that there is no knowledge of Bismarck that is unknown to this author, nor any movement of Bismarck's time that is beyond his calculation. Then we find quite appropriate and appreciable a sentence like this: 'The understanding was purely verbal, and verbal pledges from Bismarck without

corroboration were as difficult to prove as verbal offers of marriage without an engagement ring.' Or this: 'A resolution of the Reichstag, even if unanimous, had as little influence on the royal prerogative and policy in Prussia as tickling the dome of St. Paul's would have on the Dean and Chapter.'

One surprise goes with us to the end. The book has been written, or largely written, during the war, yet it is free from war prejudice. That astonishing detachment has been possible to a man hotly engaged in war work. It adds emphasis to the judgments pronounced, and above all to the judgments pronounced on Bismarck. These judgments fall at last with inevitable severity when the death of William I. takes place. 'Bismarck's devotion to his sovereign was limited to the King-Emperor. The dignity, self-respect, and patriotism of those concerned prevented the public, as distinct from a narrow circle of the initiated, from knowing the full truth of the Chancellor's conduct and relations to the Emperor, the Crown Prince and Princess, their relatives and friends. But if that chapter is ever written, it will assuredly not weaken the certainty that in the man were elements of jealousy, vulgarity, meanness, pettiness, insincerity and unscrupulousness, ineradicable and detestable. And it is desirable to remember that the material for that chapter was piled up by Bismarck himself, who knew that it could not, and would not, be given to the world, in its repellent entirety, during his lifetime—perhaps never.'

Again, 'Death can be very bitter. Had Frederick's three months of rule been dogged by prolonged physical pain and the knowledge of failure to realise his dreams, they would have been a martyrdom; but to the bitterness of pain and defeat were added, in the mystery of human things, the rebellion and treachery of an ungrateful son, and the unpardonable tyranny of his Chancellor to all whom the Emperor loved or cared for—and his own helplessness to protect or to punish. Insolence, intrigue, defamation, and defiance are never so detestable as when they are employed against the dying and by those who reckon on the security that the Angel of Death at the door will bring to their authors. There are black pages in Bismarck's record and black places in his character, but the blackest that no extenuation can obliterate are recorded in the three months from March 13 to June 15, 1888.'

It is often asserted that Bismarck disapproved of the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. Mr. Robertson has another story to tell. 'The evidence is sound that the first victories decided Bismarck's intentions to annex Alsace and Lorraine, gilt-edged by a swinging indemnity. Where exactly the frontier line would be drawn would be determined by the extent of the victories and the advice of the military experts. Throughout the prolonged negotiations he never wavered from these two conditions—the indemnity and the annexations. After 1871 Bismarck "confessed" more than once that the soldiers were responsible for the retention of Metz, and that he himself would have been content with Alsace and a strip of "German" Lorraine. The sincerity of such *obiter dicta* is more than questionable. The contemporary evidence of 1870-1 points to a wholly different conclusion. Bismarck was just as remorseless as the most truculent militarist at Headquarters. His insistence on the bombardment of Paris, his scorn at "the English catchwords of humanity and civilisation," his jeers at the sufferings of the civil population and the children in Paris, the dinner-table ridicule of the appeals and tears of Favre and Thiers—by these and fifty other similar self-revealing acts recorded and gloated over by Busch and the jackals of the back-stairs, he proved that he neither wished nor intended to be generous. Generosity would have been an unpardonable weakness. Behind the impressive record of achievement lies an unforgettable chronicle of envenomed pettiness and coarse brutality, and the pitiable part of it is that Bismarck was unaware of the depths to which he could sink; and that the Germany of Bismarck's Chancellorship could read and approve—even praise—the qualities and traits revealed in these intimate and degrading chronicles.'

THE DRAMA.

If the question is asked, What have we to do with the modern drama? the answer is 'quicquid agunt homines,' at least in books. The book before us is Mr. W. L. Courtney's *Old Saws and Modern Instances* (Chapman & Hall; 10s. 6d. net). The change of 'wise' into 'old' is due to Mr. Courtney's modesty.

It is a book about the Drama—the ancient Greek Drama and the modern English Drama—

with a few articles about Patriotism, Poetry, and Oratory. These articles may be the most popular of all. For in them we have an inspiring study of Demosthenes as an orator, a glowing study of Sappho as a poetess, a devout study of Marcus Aurelius as a diarist, and a generous study of Aspasia as a woman.

The study of Sappho is most congenial, but the study of Aspasia is most creditable. Never before has Sappho found a more unrestrained admirer, nay, not in the days of her flesh; and never before certainly has Aspasia had so heroic and unanswerable a vindication. These two papers alone give the book distinction and may give it immortality.

But its subject is the Stage. And it does not matter whether you are interested in the Stage or not; it does not matter if you are keenly antagonistic, you will read these articles on the ancient Greek and the modern English dramatists with delight and profit. Especially if you are a preacher. Mr. Courtney might have written the book for the pulpit, so many hints has he, so much direction and encouragement does he offer.

Is it the delivery of Sermons that is on your mind? It is a subject of much heart-searching to-day—read the latest Report of the Archbishop's Committee. Well, here is instruction. Here is Demosthenes and what he did for delivery. Oh, it is an old story, but have we conned it and committed it yet? We dread the preaching of Sermons because of the difficulties of delivery? Have we done as Demosthenes did? Let us hear again how he did.

'Demosthenes was not a born orator. He laboriously educated himself for his high career in spite of natural disadvantages. Probably he had as a boy some sort of impediment in his speech. His voice was not strong, and we know that his rival Æschines derided him for not being athletic or a sportsman. Numerous stories are told of his rigorous self-discipline. He is said to have shut himself up in an underground chamber, having shaved one side of his face to prevent any temptation to come out in the light of day and to ensure close and continuous study. He put pebbles into his mouth and then tried to speak against the roar of incoming waves, he recited while he ran uphill, and, according to report, wrote out with his own hand Thucydides' history eight several times. We know also that he took lessons from Isæus, an

orator of distinction, and there is also a tale that he was an eager listener to Plato. His earlier efforts at oratory were disastrous, and on one occasion after a failure while he was roaming in the Piræus he was encouraged by an actor, who took him in hand and gave him some valuable hints. There seems no question that he was not born great, but rather achieved greatness by persistent industry.'

The book is full of such instruction. It is not often so direct: perhaps it will be the more persuasive. Take one thing further. Is the modern preacher careful to adapt his preaching to the time he lives in and the people he ministers to? The dramatist is careful. Read this and think over it: 'Romance pursued up to a certain point produces a feeling of satiety or unreality, and therefore naturally gives place to an opposite theory which calls itself logical and scientific. After Victor Hugo came Zola, Ibsen, and Brieux, just as in an earlier stage of the process of development the remoteness and frigidity of the classical drama gave place to Victor Hugo's romantic enthusiasm. The important thing, however, to notice is, that the different artistic attitudes correspond to different periods in the evolution of a nation or of humanity at large. Nothing is clearer than the fact that what we sometimes call the Victorian outlook, that is to say, the attitude towards men and things congenial to the nineteenth century, is in large measure superseded, and it is interesting and important for us to recognise how the generation which we may call Georgian reacts against its predecessor. It would have been impossible in the Victorian era to produce for the public plays like *Les Avariés* and *Ghosts*. Why? Because the theory of art was different: the temper of the public was different: the atmosphere was different. The appeal of the nineteenth century was to the heart: that of the twentieth century is to logical processes of the intellect. The office of drama is to popularise, as it were, scientific conceptions, to make use of scientific principles, to illustrate them in some imagined scheme, and thus to convert and metamorphose drama into a tract for the times.'

FREEMASONRY.

The Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, Litt.D., who succeeded the Rev. R. J. Campbell in the ministry of the City Temple, was already, before he came

to this country, the author of an official handbook of Freemasonry. He has now issued the book in this country. The title is *The Builders* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is just such an account of the subject as the uninitiated require, simple, sufficient, and straightforward. No one need be ignorant of the meaning or the worth of Freemasonry after the issue of this satisfactory and accessible volume.

What is Freemasonry? This is the definition which Dr. Newton adopts from the German Handbuch. 'Masonry is the activity of closely united men who, employing symbolical forms borrowed principally from the mason's trade and from architecture, work for the welfare of mankind, striving morally to ennoble themselves and others, and thereby to bring about a universal league of mankind, which they aspire to exhibit even now on a small scale.'

Another question. What are its ethics? This is the ideal: it is quoted from the Constitutions of 1723: 'A Mason is obliged by his Tenure to obey the moral law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid Atheist nor an irreligious Libertine. But though in ancient times Masons were charged in every country to be of the religion of that country or nation, whatever it was, yet it is now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular Opinions to themselves: that is, to be Good men and True, or Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Denomination or Persuasion they may be distinguished; whereby Masonry becomes the Centre of Union and the Means of conciliating true Friendship among persons that must have remained at a perpetual distance.'

The last question. Is Masonry antagonistic to the Church? This is Dr. Newton's own answer: 'Masonry has never at any time been opposed to Christianity, or to any other religion. Far from it. But Christianity in those days—as, alas, too often now—was another name for a petty and bigoted sectarianism; and Masonry by its very genius was, and is, *unsectarian*. Many Masons then were devout Christians, as they are now—not a few clergymen—but the order itself is open to men of all faiths, Catholic and Protestant, Hebrew and Hindu, who confess faith in God; and so it will always remain if it is true to its principles and history.'

THE HISTORY OF A CHILD.

Mr. W. H. Hudson (is he the author of *Rousseau* in the 'Epoch-Makers' series?) has written the story of his early life. The title is *Far Away and Long Ago* (Dent; 15s. net). He has written it with a simplicity and sincerity, with a vividness of memory and a sympathetic tolerance, which make the book fit to be named along with that wonder of autobiography, Serge Aksakoff's *History of my Childhood*.

Mr. Hudson's early life was spent in the pampas round and about Buenos Ayres, and it is life in the pampas that he describes. It is far enough away to be a perpetual surprise, and the interest is easily maintained from chapter to chapter. But one thing is ever present to give distinction. It is the author's delight in nature. He says: 'I have told how after my fifteenth anniversary, when I first began to reflect seriously on my future life, the idea still persisted that my perpetual delight in Nature was nothing more than a condition or phase of my child's and boy's mind, and would inevitably fade out in time. I might have guessed at an earlier date that this was a delusion, since the feeling had grown in strength with the years, but it was only after I took to reading at the beginning of my sixteenth year that I discovered its true character. One of the books I read then for the first time was White's *Selborne*, given to me by an old friend of our family, a merchant in Buenos Ayres, who had been accustomed to stay a week or two with us once a year when he took his holiday. He had been on a visit to Europe, and one day, he told me, when in London on the eve of his departure, he was in a bookshop, and seeing this book on the counter and glancing at a page or two, it occurred to him that it was just the right thing to get for that bird-loving boy out on the pampas. I read and re-read it many times, for nothing so good of its kind had ever come to me, but it did not reveal to me the secret of my own feeling for Nature—the feeling of which I was becoming more and more conscious, which was a mystery to me, especially at certain moments, when it would come upon me with a sudden rush. So powerful it was, so unaccountable, I was actually afraid of it, yet I would go out my way to seek it. At the hour of sunset I would go out half a mile or so from the house, and sitting on the dry grass with hands clasped round

my knees, gaze at the western sky, waiting for it to take me. And I would ask myself: What does it mean? But there was no answer to that in any book concerning the "life and conversation of animals." I found it in other works: in Brown's *Philosophy*—another of the ancient tomes on our shelves—and in an old volume containing appreciations of the early nineteenth-century poets; also in other works. They did not tell me in so many words that it was the mystical faculty in me which produced those strange rushes or bursts of feeling and lifted me out of myself at moments; but what I found in their words was sufficient to show me that the feeling of delight in Nature was an enduring one, that others had known it, and that it had been a secret source of happiness throughout their lives.'

Thus it is the autobiography of a naturalist, but the naturalist is a boy with a boy's delight in all life, not a scientist occupied in classification. He owed much to his mother. 'There was a secret bond of union between us, since she best understood my feeling for Nature and sense of beauty, and recognized that in this I was nearest to her. Thus, besides and above the love of mother and son, we had a spiritual kinship, and this was so much to me that everything beautiful in sight or sound that affected me came associated with her to my mind. I have found this feeling most perfectly expressed in some lines to the Snowdrop by our lost poet, Dolben. I am in doubt, he wrote,

"If summer brings a flower so lovable,
Of such a meditative restfulness
As this, with all her roses and carnations.
The morning hardly stirs their noiseless bells;
Yet could I fancy that they whispered 'Home,'
For all things gentle, all things beautiful,
I hold, my mother, for a part of thee."

JERUSALEM.

Let us seize the occasion and learn more than we yet know of Jerusalem. Let us go round the city with so enthusiastic a guide as the Rev. J. E. Wright, B.A., and tell the towers thereof, mark well her bulwarks, and consider her palaces. For assuredly, as the Psalmist hints, it will be expected of us who have entered with Allenby even in imagination to tell all about it to the

generation following. Mr. Wright, in his letters from the Holy Land, published by Messrs. Jarrolds (7s. 6d. net), tells us about Jerusalem and much more. He calls his book *Round About Jerusalem*. For he has chapters even on Samaria, Petra, and Galilee.

There is a refreshing simplicity and directness in the letters, the immediate impression recorded without reserve. 'The next day we rested. I determined not to go to Damascus as many travellers do, because I wanted to get to know one country well. Besides this, as it happened all Syria was in quarantine, and there would have been much difficulty in getting back. I just spent the day in wandering over the Galilean hills. The following morning three of us started off on horseback before sunrise to see the Lake of Merom. We descended by a very steep path into the valley of the Jordan and then galloped over the plain to the south end of the lake. Horses here do not trot or canter, they either walk fast over the rough tracks, picking their way between the rocks, or when they do reach an open and level stretch like their native desert, gallop madly for the sheer joy of the sensation. You should have seen us going over the plain that morning. I have learnt to ride like the natives, getting free of the stirrups, crouching down and gripping on to the horse's flanks with my heels. My!!! it was grand.'

Here is the description of a moment in the ceremony of the Holy Fire in Jerusalem: 'Suddenly the Patriarch pushes a light out of each of the holes and a fearful state of confusion ensues; every one is fighting for the light, way is made for the special runners to dash off at full speed to the men on horseback outside, who ride furiously to Bethlehem, Nazareth, etc., and even to Jaffa, where there are special steamers to carry it on to Constantinople, Egypt, etc. In less than one minute the whole church is one blaze of light, every one has a bunch of from twenty to thirty candles blazing away, and bundles are being handed up by strings into all the galleries, the place is filled with smoke, and you can well imagine you are in a burning church. It is a stupendous scene. The pilgrims believe that this fire will not hurt them, and it seems as if it is so, for you see them passing the flames of their candles all over their faces and washing their hands in it. It is said that they believe it is miraculously sent down from Heaven, but apart

from this deception I think the idea is very fine—the Light of Life coming from the tomb and spreading from church to church throughout the world. When once you get accustomed to the confusion which always attends these services, you see that the underlying idea is usually very fine.'

The East may still be the unchanging East, but to eyes like Mr. Wright's it is full of life and movement.

The aim of every editor is to make his magazine readable from cover to cover. Mr. Holbrook Jackson, the editor of *To-Day*, reaches his aim. More than that, the half-yearly volume is readable from cover to cover. We have read it. It is more than the reading of a number. It means that there is both excellence and variety enough to carry the reader right on from one month's issue to another.

It is a literary magazine. And like one's familiar newspaper, all the items every month are where you expect them to be. First the emblem—always about 'to-day.' This, for June 1918, is from Julius Hare: 'Nobody has ever been able to change to-day into to-morrow—or into yesterday; and yet everybody, who has much energy of character, is trying to do one or the other.' Next the portrait. There are portraits of Sturge Moore, Blake, Cyril Scott, Herbert Trench, Siegfried Sassoon, and Rupert Brooke. Then comes the magazine with its Editor's Notes, Poetry, Articles, Maxims, Reviews, and End Papers all in order and appetising.

There is an article on Siegfried Sassoon. Do you know Sassoon and his war poems? This is his:

Good-bye, old lad! Remember me to God,
And tell Him that our Politicians swear
They won't give in till Prussian Rule's been
trod
Under the heel of England. . . . Are you
there? . . .

Yes . . . and the War won't end for at least
two years;
But we've got stacks of men . . . I'm blind
with tears,
Staring into the dark. Cheero!
I wish they'd killed you in a decent show.

To-Day is a sixpenny monthly, published at 29 Bedford Street, Strand. The volume costs 6s. 6d. net.

Dr. Henry Burton Sharman has condensed his *Studies in the Life of Christ* into a compact carryable volume and called it *Jesus in the Records* (New York: Association Press; 75 cents).

The story of the work of the Bible Society for 1917-1918 has been told, under the title of *For Such a Time as This* (Bible House), and a very fine story there is to tell. Take this: 'The fortunes of the Society's depot at Jerusalem read like a page of romance. Early in 1915 our representative was forced to withdraw to Egypt, and for nearly three years no certain news came from the Holy City. But an American resident, who was allowed to remain in Jerusalem, promptly stepped into the breach; he took up his quarters in our depot and slept behind the counter, and for thirty-four months held out bravely amid many hardships, living on his sales until relief arrived. A British officer writes: "When I entered Jerusalem with the first British troops in December, I was met by a quaint old man, seventy years of age, who told me he represented the Bible Society, and presented me with a beautiful copy of the Scriptures." About 30,000 volumes, in some fifty languages, were safe at the depot; and all the English editions were swiftly bought up by our British soldiers. The society hopes to commemorate the deliverance of Jerusalem by erecting there a new Bible House, which shall not be unworthy of the city, and some special gifts have already been received for this object.'

Mr. E. Williamson Mason is a conscientious objector and he has suffered for it. He does not complain that he has suffered for it; he does not even complain of the severity of his sufferings. In the book which he has written, and to which he has given the title of *Made Free in Prison* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net), he simply sets down his experiences. He was allowed to write letters, and he wrote long letters to his friend and benefactor, the late Mr. H. Litchfield Woods. These letters form the book. They are graphic, straight, manly. Under the circumstances their complete absence of outcry is marvellous. But why was it all necessary, and why was it all so hard to bear?

It was some prominent politician—was it the Prime Minister himself?—who said that when the war is fought and won problems will face us which will tax our energies as utterly as the war itself. How are we to meet them? With a sensitive conscience. There is no other way. And it must be, not the conscience of one here and one there, but a universal or at least a European conscience. The purpose of Mr. Alexander W. Rimington, late Professor of Fine Arts in Queen's College, London, in writing his book on *The Conscience of Europe* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), is to tell us what such a conscience means and how we may have it. Here is a pregnant paragraph:

'Too many preachers deliver sermons upon the war in which they dwell (truly enough) upon the noble spirit of self-sacrifice shown by the nation and the devotion of its men and women; upon its great achievements, the unselfishness of its aims and its determination to go on to "the bitter end"—without any counterbalancing statement of its sins, private and public, of the evils of greed, envy, luxury, dishonesty, grasping diplomacy and national selfishness which helped to make the war possible. They too often infuse a pleasant glow of self-satisfaction into the minds of their congregations and fail to awaken that sense of responsibility towards humanity at large and towards God which comes before a narrow nationalism and which is of the essence of Christ's teaching.'

Professor Rimington agrees with Lord Hugh Cecil that we need a new conception of nationality, and he strives to give it. For (he quotes from Dr. Homes Dudden), 'what sort of triumph would it be if we were to emerge from this ghastly struggle, victorious indeed in our arms, but embittered, intolerant, arrogant, revengeful, more inclined to believe in the effectiveness of bluster and brute force, and less regardful of moral and religious considerations—if, in a word, we were to exchange the soul of England for the soul of Germany?'

How we envy the wealth and magnificence of the American Universities. And with how much reason. We have only to see some of their publications. Where is the British University that could produce great handsome volumes on Semitic Philology like those which issue at steady intervals from the University of California? The latest is an imperial octavo of four hundred and forty-four

pages, and the title of it is *Studies in Biblical Parallelism*. There are two parts. Part I. is on Parallelism in Amos, by Louis I. Newman; Part II. on Parallelism in Isaiah, chapters i.-x., by William Popper.

It is a study in Hebrew poetry then—the most searching and significant study surely that has appeared since Lowth, and that is a long time ago. It is what we should now call a scientific study, for every part is wrought as if it were a proposition in Euclid. And the end? There are two ends in view. First, an accurate acquaintance with the laws and licences of Hebrew poetry. Next, and not less, a new apparatus for the more reliable criticism of the Old Testament literature, its authorship and relationship. Did ever editors of Old Testament books have a keener temptation offered them freely to amend the Hebrew text? These editors have not fallen before it.

The Oxford University Press has issued a *Wide Margin Bible for Students*. It is printed on a specially prepared Oxford India paper, which is not only opaque but also non-absorbent. The margin is not very wide, the size of the volume being a consideration, but there is writing paper at the beginning and at the end. The paper at the beginning is prepared as an Index to the Notes. The copy in our hands, beautiful and rich, costs 18s. 6d. net. There are other bindings and other prices. It is an important addition to the long series of Students' Bibles issued from Oxford.

The Schweich Lectures hold an honourable place among lectureships. The first course, delivered by Professor Driver, set a standard which every succeeding lecturer, well chosen, has striven to maintain. The latest lecturer is Leonard W. King, M.A., Litt.D., F.S.A., Assistant Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, and Professor in the University of London. His subject is *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in relation to Hebrew Tradition* (Oxford University Press; 3s. net).

It is a handsome (though at present unbound) volume, well printed on good paper, and furnished with excellent indexes. It contains the most recent and assured results of research, set forth in a clear and even popular English style. It is crowded with matters of interest and even of necessary knowledge for the student of the Old

Testament. Take this emphatic and somewhat disconcerting statement about the Flood: 'To the Sumerians who first told the story, the great Flood appeared to have destroyed mankind, for Southern Babylonia was for them the world. Later peoples who heard it have fitted the story to their own geographical horizon, and in all good faith and by a purely logical process the mountain-tops are represented as submerged, and the ship, or ark, or chest, is made to come to ground on the highest peak known to the story-teller and his hearers. But in its early Sumerian form it is just a simple tradition of some great inundation, which overwhelmed the plain of Southern Babylonia and was peculiarly disastrous in its effects. And so its memory survived in the picture of Ziusudu's solitary coracle upon the face of the waters, which, seen through the mists of the Deluge tradition, has given us the Noah's ark of our nursery days.'

The Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D., who succeeded Canon Scott Holland as Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford, delivered his inaugural lecture on June 18, and has now published it with the title of *The Study of Theology* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 1s. 3d. net). The study of theology to-day makes four demands: (1) it must be the interpretation of a deep and simple religious experience; (2) it must be the recognition of the full stream of Christian tradition, that throughout the centuries the Christian Church has been taught by the Spirit who will lead us into all truth; (3) it must have freedom; and (4) it must be the spirit of reverent criticism. Under the last demand Professor Headlam says: 'I am inclined to think that a chief task for Oxford theology at the present time is the criticism of modern methods of literary criticism. A study of much that is written nowadays about the Old and New Testaments must reveal the absence in many of those who claim to be critics of anything approaching a scientific method, a serious incapacity to distinguish between what I may call "guess-work" and scientific proof. Let me take some illustrations. A few years ago we were all attracted by a brilliant book on the history of German Research on the Life of Christ, published under the title *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*. We admired, no doubt, the prodigious and serious intellectual effort of which it narrated the history, and marvelled, as we have often done since, at the sustained mental energy

and the equally strange mental limitations of a remarkable race. But a second thought that must have arisen in many minds was, how little progress had been the result of this century and a half of toil, and when we come to examine the cause of this we find that nowhere is there any discrimination between the brilliant hypothesis and the scientific proof. Have you ever attempted to study the German rationalistic theology of fifty years ago and discovered how unconvincing it now seems? The current philosophy, or the political situation, or the theological movement of the time created a certain mental atmosphere. In harmony with this atmosphere the Gospel narrative was reconstructed. To minds with certain presuppositions the distinction between true and false seemed easy, and our theologians did not perceive that often, if I may use the expressive language of my old master Ridding, they were trying to hoist themselves by their own belts. They built their reconstruction on their historical criticism, but the criterion of their criticism was harmony with the reconstruction. A study of the failures of the past ought to make us cautious in accepting the theories, however brilliant, of the present.

No man in the world has done more 'exploring' than Professor W. M. Flinders Petrie, and when he writes of *Eastern Exploration Past and Future* (Constable; 2s. 6d. net), he writes of what he knows. He can write too. His story is a good one; he tells it with striking effect.

Messrs. Gowans & Gray have issued a revised and enlarged edition of *Prayers*, by the Rev. James Robertson Cameron, D.Phil. That is a sign of the times, and there is not a better.

Under the title of *The Father of the Red Triangle* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), Mr. J. E. Hodder Williams has reissued his *Life of Sir George Williams*, first published in 1906. It contains a large number of new portraits and other illustrations.

John Brown of Haddington deserves a capable and appreciative modern biographer. He has found him in the Rev. Robert Mackenzie, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net). The volume is a crown octavo of nearly four hundred pages, and there are about twenty illustrations. To do it at

all at this time of day was to do it thoroughly. For we know the leading facts and we have general impressions of John Brown and his life. What we need is such a minute loyal study as this, so that in the reading of the book one learns to love as well as know him and to desire to be like him—surely the test of the biography of a good man.

In some respects it is an astounding story. It is so in two respects at least. First in the fact that because John Brown, the hero, learned Latin and Greek and Hebrew on the hillside, he was charged with witchcraft and lay under the terrible stigma for five years—his own minister refusing even then to sign his certificate of Church membership.

The other astonishing fact is the way he learned these languages. Let us hear Mr. Mackenzie about that:

'His browsing in Latin fields led him to seek the richer pasturage of Greek, and acquaintance with the very words of the New Testament. He was too modest to ask guidance in this more exclusive region. Latin then was common property; not so Greek; and he conceived a plan to reach his goal by himself, rather ingenious and entirely original. He took his *Ovid*, an old Latin grammar, and the names of the New Testament, especially the genealogies of the first chapter of Matthew, and the third chapter of Luke. The last he divined to be transcripts of the Greek, and to suggest the key to unlock the door between the two languages. "Reason told me," he argued, "that at least an unaccidented tongue could not much change names from what they were in the Greek." With these he made a discovery of the Greek characters, as true a discovery as Dr. Young's of the characters of the Rosetta stone, or Rawlinson's of the cuneiform letters. He compared the names and the letters verse by verse with the English. He treated the Greek as an expert uses a cypher, and bit by bit with wonderful patience and ingenuity, he learned the sound of the letters. Though only making guesses at the meaning, yet, by comparing it with the English, he was able to read the Greek. Then, having acquired so much Greek, he pushed on to Hebrew.'

Mr. Harold Owen has an intense antipathy to pacifism and he has the literary power of expressing it. His book entitled *Disloyalty: The Blight of Pacifism* (Hurst & Blackett; 6s. net) is a terrific onslaught on the British pacifists; it can be ade-

quately compared only with Marshal Foch's onslaught upon the German armies. For you never know when or where he will strike; you know only that he will strike hard.

Mr. Owen is not greatly enamoured of a League of Nations. He does not scoff at it. Nobody does so now. But for his part he will approve of it when (some time hence) he sees it working successfully. 'Indeed,' he says, 'it is to be doubted whether the world at present possesses the statesmen who could carry through such a gigantic reconstruction of the world's polity, for assuredly it would put to the test higher qualities of constructive statesmanship than are at present revealed to our admiration in any country.' And no wonder, for 'the League of Nations, however attractive because of its ideality—just as is the Millennium itself—appals by its difficulties.' But Mr. Owen does not object to the idea of a League; what he objects to is the putting of the idea into practice. 'In one sense,' he says, 'this is indeed the most favourable time within the history of man to talk of a "League of Nations," because never was the desirability and the necessity of any plan to make war difficult of recurrence more manifest to the slow intelligence. But the slow intelligence becomes dangerously rapid when it wants to take a single leap from Armageddon to the Millennium—man does not progress by such violent jumps and recoils. And in a much deeper sense this is the most unfavourable time within the history of man for attempting to put the idea into practice.'

The Unitarian Faith in Unitarian Hymns is the title of an attractive small volume compiled by the Rev. W. Copeland Bowie (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net). They may be Unitarian, but they are hymns that we can all sing; two of them are in all our hymnaries. A short account of its author is added to each hymn.

The Essex Hall Lecture for 1918 was delivered by Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, M.A. The subject chosen by him was *The Place of Judaism among the Religions of the World* (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net). It is really the place of Liberal Judaism, for Mr. Montefiore believes in that form of Judaism only, and believes it has a future. What is its message? 'The function of Judaism among the religions of the world is, then, as I conceive it, to preserve, and, as occasion may serve, to proclaim

and make known, an ethical Monotheism, historic, upon the one hand, yet independent of criticism, upon the other; already rich, yet capable of becoming richer. This Monotheism of reconciliation and balance, while subject to peculiar difficulties, is also possessed of peculiar qualities. I would not for a moment aver that the most orthodox Trinitarian cannot love God as keenly and as profoundly as the most convinced Jewish Unitarian. I would not for a moment deny that many such Trinitarians may love Him a great deal better than many such Unitarians. But I do believe that it is true to say that the full resources of the Father are only known to those for whom all that Son and Spirit may be to others are for them concentrated in Him. In other words, the God of Judaism may be—I quite admit—a thin God, a poor God; but He can be also amazingly rich. And if one is to judge the real value of a religion, one must take its God idea, not at its poorest, but at its best.'

Under the title of *Preparing the Way* (Macmillan; 5s. net), the Rev. Frank Streatfeild, B.D., has written a volume in which he describes the influence of Judaism of the Greek period on the earliest developments of Christianity. First he describes its influence on life and thought and then on language. The most frequently discussed topic at present is Apocalyptic Thought and Literature, and that aspect of his subject is clearly and accurately and yet briefly set forth by Mr. Streatfeild. But simplicity, brevity, and accuracy characterize every part of the book. Very useful will be the bibliography at the beginning, and not less valuable are the discussions at the end and the various lists and references.

What do *Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist* mean to a liberal Churchman? The Rev. John Gamble, B.D., will tell you if you read his book with that title (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). The Eucharist means (1) Fraternity; (2) Thankfulness; (3) Communion; and (4) Sacrifice. On the last Mr. Gamble says: 'Even when such a theory is rejected as destroying the nature of a sacrament by effacing the outward sign and leaving only the thing symbolized, the Eucharist may still be truly described as a sacrifice. Our union with Christ is a union with Him in sacrifice.'

The *Tales of the Sorbonne* which Mrs. Rachel Fox has written (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net) are studies rather than tales; studies in experience. And in that lies their interest. Whatever of incident there may be is of no account, and is made nothing of; all is of aim in life, and its end, with a surprising insight into the character that aims and ends. The end is failure for the most part. Was it not bound to be?

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have issued a new edition of Dr. Grattan Guinness's *The Approaching End of the Age*, edited and revised by the Rev. E. H. Horne, M.A., Rector of Garsington, Oxford (6s. net).

The lecture which Mr. Charles H. Thompson, Curator of the Watts Picture Gallery, has published under the title of *Some Pictures by G. F. Watts, R.A., and their Message* (Newton; 1s.), is an easy and excellent introduction. Have it in your hand when you go.

In your reading on the Holy Spirit discriminate. *The Holy Spirit and the Individual*, by Canon Arthur W. Robinson (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net), is safe. It is also stimulating. If there is not much of it, it gets home every time.

Canon J. H. B. Masterman's *Studies in the Book of Revelation* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net) are a real aid to the understanding of the Apocalypse. For the author is aware of the progress which has been made in the study of Apocalyptic and has a scientific as well as a devout mind. Lay aside for the present all the 'prophetic' books and read this book carefully. Then return to the prophets if you can.

Of that most welcome though most modest series, 'Texts for Students,' issued by the S.P.C.K., number two is *Selections from Matthew Paris*, by Miss Caroline A. J. Skeel, and number three *Selections from Giralduus Cambrensis*, also by Miss Skeel (9d. net each). We are a lazy lot; we want translations 'on the opposite page.' There is no encouragement to indolence here.

The Archbishops have determined to set their house in order. Not that they or theirs may die, but that they may live. They appointed a Committee to inquire into the way in which Christianity

was taught in the Church. That Committee has issued its Report, under the title of *The Teaching Office of the Church* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). It is an unsparing exposure of ignorant clergy and ineffective teachers; and yet the Archbishop of Canterbury has not flinched from sending it out with a recommendation that it be read throughout the land.

The charges are three. The Committee states them as coming both from outsiders and from members of the Church. The first is a charge of intellectual failure, the second of practical failure, and the third of social failure. 'More particularly is the charge of failure directed against the clergy of the Church of England. On the one side, they are said to be often deficient in conviction and force and spiritual vitality; they fail, owing to their professional habit of mind, to understand the religious life of their people. On the other side, they are said to be out of touch with the normal intellectual life of the time. Compared with the modern standard of intellectual attainment in the country, they relatively take a much lower place than they did; for this reason amongst others their preaching is felt to be commonplace and ineffective; and they fail as teachers because, while the standard of teaching has been raised, they have taken no advantage of new methods. They are deficient in intellectual alertness and intellectual courage.'

What does the Committee say? 'We desire,' they say, 'to guard against an exaggerated view of the failure of the Church in the delivery of its message. In spite of some alarming features we recognize the wide influence, both direct and indirect, of Christian teaching and morality in this country, the spiritual power and intellectual ability of many of the clergy, and the existence of a large body of loyal laymen. Yet we feel that there is much truth in the charges. The Church has not the influence it ought to have attained in the general life of the country. There are many in every class throughout the nation who do not come under Christian influence, and would resent the guidance of the Church. There are others who are ready to listen and yet feel that they do not get what they need. The Church often fails to give its message effectively, and many of the clergy are deficient in spiritual earnestness, in intellectual capacity and outlook.'

The two volumes of the S.P.C.K.'s Greek Texts in their series of Translations of Christian Litera-

ture have been issued. One is *St. Dionysius of Alexandria: Letters and Treatises* (3s. 6d. net). The editor is the Rev. Charles Lett Feltoe, D.D. The choice of editor was almost inevitable, for Dr. Feltoe edited this Father's writings for the Cambridge Patristic Texts. Since he published that edition in 1904, Dr. Feltoe has learned more about Dionysius than he knew, and so this volume is not only a welcome selection well translated, but also a Supplement to the Cambridge edition of the Works of Dionysius.

The other volume, edited by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., is *The Lausiac History of Palladius* (5s. net). This time the Cambridge editor was not available, and Mr. Lowther Clarke had an extremely difficult task. Its difficulty was not only in mastering and translating a great book, but also in making modern and acceptable a very ancient and very peculiar product of Christian life. The Introduction is right well done, an enjoyable piece of writing and a true entrance into the book. A short paragraph may be quoted. It contains an apology for monasticism. 'If we believe in prayer as the noblest and most fruitful activity of man's nature, we shall probably be led to believe that God separates some to a life of prayer, and that the mass of mankind dwell in greater security, thanks to the protecting wall of the prayers of these separated ones. It is because the monks of Egypt put spiritual things first, albeit sometimes in an exaggerated and strained fashion, and believed in the life of prayer, that their example is of permanent value to Christendom.'

The translation, it is needless to say, is reliable. It is also readable.

Mr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has written a book on *The Meaning of Faith*. It is published in this country by the Committee of the Student Christian Movement (3s. 6d. net). Though it is a small book it has much in it. And all is admirably conceived and set forth. To suit the study circles it is divided into twelve weeks with portions for every day of each week. The relevant passages of Scripture are quoted; and prayers, taken from good sources, are interspersed throughout.

The Sunday School Union has issued its series of books for the use of teachers of the Lessons for 1919. There are three books.

First, *The International Lesson Pocket Notes*

(1s. 6d. net) is written and printed and cut down to the lowest limit that eyes can see or hands can handle. The full text of the lesson is given; then follow a short Introduction, brief expository Notes, a table of Topics, and two or three illustrations. The illustrations are the weakness, the only weakness.

Next, *Notes on the Morning Lessons* (1s. 6d. net). This book is larger, the type much larger. The text of the Lesson is omitted—wisely, all teachers of the Morning Lesson possess hand Bibles. The other is a book for the pupil (through the mouth of the teacher), this is a book for the teacher. To see the manner of it, read this paragraph from the comments on 'The Story of the Good Samaritan': "Christ's greatest teaching is surely His own example. To Him came the poor, the sick, the halt, the lame, the blind, the sinful, the lonely; and He healed and helped them all. Indeed, His presence here at all is His greatest act of compassion. 'He was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor.' In the light of His own life we must read this parable. The story needs no explanation. He means to say that wherever on life's rough road we meet with the broken, afflicted, troubled ones, then our attitude must be one of self-forgetful love; we must spend and be spent in ministering to our brothers and sisters of sorrow." (This extract is from *Religion, Morals, and Manners*, a book of Bible Teaching (3s. 6d.), which then proceeds to give several beautiful illustrations of this lesson. Teachers should get the book. In the same chapter is given *Abou Ben Adhem*, which certainly ought to be read to a class studying this parable, and Matthew Arnold's story-poem, *St. Brandan*. Indeed, it collects Bible teaching on "Our Attitude to the Distressed." Teachers should quote, also, war stories of Germans helping wounded Englishmen, and Englishmen risking their lives to save Germans. Thank God, there have been hundreds of such cases.)'

Lastly, there is the large well-bound volume entitled *Notes on the Scripture Lessons* (4s. 6d. net). It is the Pocket-book magnified and much improved. The reading is better and it is better to read. The illustrations now are modern, virile, and to the point.

General Allenby is pleasing us all with his victories. We should seize the moment to read a book called *The Riddle of Nearer Asia*, written by Mr. Basil Mathews, and published by the United

Council for Missionary Education. It is about the easiest way we know of following the armies with understanding, and it is so well written that we should read it for the mere delight of the reading. Where will you find a picture of Arab life or an estimate of Arab character more vivid or comprehensible? And you had better understand the Arab. For 'his leaders begin to-day to dream of a Pan-Arabian programme that shall somehow unify the scattered tribes that lie under French and British protectorates in Africa and in Aden, in Mesopotamia, and under ineffective yet cramping Turkish control in Syria and Cilicia. That programme is necessarily vague, but it springs from a desire for a fuller life that will more completely realize the great possibilities that lie concealed within the Arab race.'

The fullest Notes on the Sunday School Lessons

are to be found in the *Methodist Sunday School Notes* (Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Department). That much can be said at once on a comparison between this volume and the similar volume issued by the Sunday School Union. Another thing can be said. The authors of the Notes are given in the Methodist book, and those who know their work already, the work of Mr. C. F. Hunter, B.A., for example, or the work of Mrs. E. E. Whimster, will understand the advantage of that. All the lessons are annotated and illustrated in this generous volume—the Morning Lesson of the Sunday School Union List, the Afternoon Lesson of the British International List, the Standard Graded Course, and the Missionary Lesson. As for illustrations, the most difficult field to cultivate is the Missionary literature: Mrs. Whimster has a genius for it—the genius, no doubt, that consists in taking pains.

Comparative Religion—and After.

BY STANLEY A. COOK, M.A., CAMBRIDGE.

It is hardly necessary at this time of day to enlarge upon the nature or the value of the comparative study of religions as it is now pursued. The interest in it, and the importance attached to it, are sufficiently indicated by the numerous works devoted to the accumulation of material, the investigation of special points, the solution of particular problems and so forth. Need one do more than recall the voluminous *Golden Bough*, or refer to so symptomatic a fact as an Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics? The study itself, and the spirit in which it is conducted, are in harmony with that aspect of 'democracy' which—to a certain extent at least—respects the existence of every religion, but also permits nothing to lie outside the scope of criticism. Both are significant also of the prevalent anxiety to find *some* satisfying answer to the perplexing and often somewhat novel questions which are raised by one's reading, by reflexion upon current events, or as a result of personal experience.

But when religions have been 'compared' and the resemblances and differences duly registered, much still remains to be done. The mere com-

parison of religious data, the impressions we gain, the conclusions we draw and the theories we formulate, do not bring us to the goal of our labours, if only for the reason that individuals find themselves in hopeless conflict touching their results. In fact, the study of religions soon leads to a new stage; the comparison of religions is found to involve that of religious attitudes and of attitudes to religion, and at a stroke the whole subject becomes more intimate and personal. Attitudes to religion or to religious 'data' (in the widest sense) are no less important than the data themselves. When religion is in any way involved—be it Australian Totemism, the *Golden Bough*, or the Angels of Mons, etc. etc.—what we feel or think, what we express by our conduct or remarks, become veritable data for a deeper study of what religion really betokens. Ancient or savage ritual and myth are not the only data on which to base a clearer conception of religion: modern conduct, attitudes and arguments—whether we consider the conscientious objector, Bolshevik atrocities, German 'hypocrisy,' or the occultism, magic and false mysticism in our midst—these, in a word, are of

the greatest significance for a view of religion which shall do justice to the facts and be helpful for the future.

Where religion is concerned, our beliefs and practices can be regarded as at least *implying* convictions, propositions, theories and the like, which concern our ideas of Reality. What *is* the Universe, if so-and-so be really true and all its implications developed? It is always easier to pass what is virtually a value-judgment from our own current point of view than to work out the implications of conduct or beliefs in a way that would fulfil the Golden Rule of Criticism, namely, of treating the ideas of others with the consideration we should desire for our own. Yet the trend of thought is such that sooner or later the more difficult and delicate problems raised by modern religious 'data' must be fought out. Just as past diplomacy tabooed certain international questions because they were too dangerous for a more than conventional discussion, so, in the realm of religion, there are problems which are speedily seen to be so personally vital that there is a natural desire to resort to compromise, and to refrain from disturbing them. Yet perchance there may be a spark—some Serajevo incident—which will bring to a head the problems the finality and overpowering importance of which are so widely recognized.

The very fact that there are questions which are felt to be so profoundly vital has this significance, that typically religious ideas (*a*) are more *personally* real to us than those which are not religious, and (*b*) when they are not felt to be ultimate realities, they are at least felt to be nearer the actual Ultimate Realities themselves than all the surest and most 'real' data of our sciences. Of all ages and lands it is true that religion characteristically involves conceptions of the greatest and most vital realities, so far as they are apprehended in the light of current thought and experience. At the same time, comparison reveals transitions of thought such that one has to recognize—bearing in mind one's own past life-history—the possibility of a further development of conceptions of reality, even though one is entirely unable at present to imagine the advance or to conjecture the form ideas will take.

Now, in the world as known by Science, wrong conceptions of the True and Real sooner or later lead to failure. There are limits: in spite of my ignorance of Science there are *certain* things I

seem to achieve successfully; in spite of the laws of health, I can go to *certain* lengths in offending against them. And in general, as regards all that is effective, in the widest sense, certain things are indispensable for their success, certain things inevitably preclude success. It is frequently patent, on the one hand, that evil succeeds because the necessary effective steps have been taken, and in accordance with effective laws; whereas, on the other hand, good will fail because of something which 'in the nature of the case' must invalidate it. If we 'happen' to do or to refrain from doing what 'happens' to ensure or to preclude the effect, we must obviously expect the logical consequences. Progress essentially consists in making the 'happen' less indefinite; and in the history of thought the stress lies now on the religious and now on the non-religious side. The disputed efficacy of prayer is an illustration.

But this dichotomy is not absolute. Human consciousness, in the phase of it which we call 'religious,' testifies to a Power which is felt to be *personally* all-sufficing and all-powerful, even though men suffer what otherwise seems calculated to overthrow their convictions. The 'religious' and the 'non-religious' phases are so far at least interconnected. Moreover, when we speak of a 'religious' belief or practice, or of 'Religion' being or doing so-and-so, it is very important to realize that in the last analysis we refer to experiences, and so forth, which are a natural and integral part of the whole individual experience, and which are put in a special category in order to mark and maintain their distinctiveness or uniqueness. It can be shown inductively by the ordinary comparison of 'religious' and 'non-religious' data—what is also to be expected *a priori* on psychological grounds—that the 'religious' consciousness or the 'religious' experience which leads to the specific convictions and formulations of the Ultimate Realities cannot be regarded as finally distinct from the 'non-religious.'

While in the world of Science we all agree in recognizing the necessity of conforming to the True and the Real, on the other hand, where religion is involved, we seem to have what are different conceptions or 'theories' of Reality. And these not only tend to conflict with one another, but any of them, if felt or shown to be really true, would have the profoundest significance for our entire life and thought. There is the

'theory' that God stands aloof from mundane or secular affairs, that an Emperor or State can represent the Ultimate Power for all human purposes, that the 'religious' sphere is something quite apart from ordinary practical life. Or religion may be tolerated as a merely private affair, so long as it does not interfere with the Government (*e.g.* in Bolshevism). Again we may contrast the indefinite part religious conceptions hold in the ideal of a League of Nations with the ages and lands where religious, international, and political convictions are organically interconnected.

The fight against evil, and the faith that Might is not Right, involve or imply conceptions of the real nature of the Universe which are immensely more profound than the 'non-religious' and crude rationalistic ideas that prevail on all sides. 'Scientific' thought does not give us the Ultimate Realities in a way that answers the inmost aspirations—perhaps of the scientist himself. In fact, human behaviour always implies a 'theory' of the Ultimate Realities far more sweeping than any we can properly formulate, and there is something remarkable, in this age of crisis, in the implications logically inherent in the great activities or ideas, which we detest or accept, as the case may be, and the sporadic, incomplete and imperfect formulations of what Ultimate Reality is.

Thus, the idea of God's blessing or His help really involves a gigantic 'theory' of the Universe which should logically leave its traces throughout all religious and non-religious thought. And even if we assume that there is nothing in the Universe to justify this idea, we must still ask, What is man, what is human nature, that the idea should even prevail and be maintained? What is the Universe if the highest type of organic life claims such conceptions of the environment? What theory *then* can we find? The problem is to find a theory of the Universe and of Reality, such that we can understand both the religious and the non-religious convictions that prevail, and the best theory will be that which deals most fairly with its rivals and opponents. It can hardly be that the Ultimate Realities are inconsequential and contradictory; the essential differences must lie in the experience and life-history of the individuals who give us their 'religious' and 'non-religious' convictions which Comparative Religion can classify and co-ordinate.

The comparative study of religions leads to a comparative study of religious and non-religious

thought, in order to form a conception of religion *within* the total world of thought, even as the 'religious' modes, phases and moments of the individual, *which are the source of our data for conceptions of religion*, are only a part of his total life and experience. The immediate, practicable problem, and one that can be handled along scientific lines, is not the discovery of the Ultimate Realities; it is rather the treatment of them as implied or formulated by men, it is the study of the development of minds which fashion, accept, or dispute formulations of the nature of effective Reality on the basis of the tone of their experience.

The question of the significance of religion is not merely 'pietistic.' A new stage in the conditions amid which the Great War arose is at hand, and the nearer the end of the war the more do we realize that the 'psychical unrest' (if this general term may be used), which was so marked before August 1914, has not been allayed. Indeed, it is said that in Russia, at all events, there has been a worse hell under Bolshevism than even under Tzarism, while as for the ideal of a League of Nations, it can hardly be said that any present scheme touches the 'psychological roots' of the problems in a way that would remove the infelt sense of insecurity, dissatisfaction and unrest. On the one hand, all effective life *implies* some sort of a theory of Reality; on the other hand, 'psychical unrest,' however it may manifest itself, must persist until an equilibrium has been found which shall enable one to face the future and all conceivable risks with courage and hope. Individuals may find a solution, in their faith or in their philosophy, but a harmoniously adjusted environment, whether of individuals or of nations, requires an adjustment of the various religious and non-religious conceptions of Reality which now unite and now divide.

The comparative study of religion thus leads to a further inquiry into the forceful ideas which make or mar men and peoples. We are 'up against' Reality at every moment of our lives; but who can say how much of our successful work, in peace or in war, is due to causes which belong distinctively to the realm of what we call 'religion'? Are we handicapped by any indifference on our part to the religious consciousness of what the Universe is? Are the Ultimate Realities indifferent to our conception of what they are? Or is there

truth in that conviction, which recurs in varying forms, that man can co-operate with these Realities, and the better his conception of them, the more effective and permanent the result of his activities? If the Great War may be regarded as the conflict between truer and falser conceptions of the nature of the Universe, we shall only be deceiving ourselves if we think that there are not other false conceptions. All our efforts to spread our

'culture,' to reform peoples,' or in any way to further the progress of humanity, imply at bottom particular theories of the Universe and the Ultimate Realities; hence it would seem only self-evident that a consciously held view on these vital questions must be the precondition of our success.¹

¹ For an attempt to work out the data of religion on the lines indicated above, the writer may be permitted to refer to his article 'Religion' in the new volume of the *E.R.E.*

In the Study.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

For the Sundays in Advent, consider the purpose of Christ in coming into the world.

- I. To fulfil the Law and the Prophets—Mt 5¹⁷.
- II. To give His life a Ransom—Mt 20²⁸.
- III. To offer abundant Life—Jn 10¹⁰.
- IV. To witness for the Truth—Jn 18³⁷.

Advent Sunday.

'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.'—Mt 5¹⁷.

LITERATURE.—Phillips Brooks, *Twenty Sermons*, 1886; L. Campbell, *Some Aspects of the Christian Ideal*, 1877; J. Stuart Holden, *The Confidence of Faith*, 1916; J. Cynddylan Jones, *Studies in the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1888; F. G. Peabody, *Mornings in the College Chapel*, 1st Ser., 1896; W. Scott Palmer, *The Ladder of Reality*, 1915; E. F. Russell, *Father Stanton's Last Sermons in S. Alban's, Holborn*, 1915; D. Swing, *Truths for To-day*, i., 1874; W. Temple, *Church and Nation*, 1915; J. M. Wilson, *God's Progressive Revelations of Himself to Men*, 1916.

It has been well said that he who would speak to the times must speak from Eternity. The only satisfying interpretation of life is that which we get when we stand upon the hills of God, where by the side of Christ we are able to see things in their true proportion and perspective. Unaided and unelevated vision is bound to be mistaken. It is only in His light that we see light. And nothing is more needed to-day than that we should look out upon life, not as an insoluble mystery, and upon its happenings, not as a hopeless tangle, but as the expression of the everlasting nature of God. That Christ once came, declaring fully and finally the principles and the purpose of the Divine Government, makes it possible so to regard life,

even in its most troublous days, without fear or panic. To attempt, however, to understand its changing experiences apart from Him is sheer folly and hopeless darkness. Christ has not only the keys of death and hell, but of Life also. He openeth, and no man can shut. He shutteth, and no man can open.

i. Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. A great many people still think that Jesus came to destroy. The religious life appears to them a life of giving up things. Renunciation seems the Christian motto. The religious person forsakes his passions, denies his tastes, mortifies his body, and then is holy. But Jesus always answers that He comes not to destroy, but to fill full; not to preach the renunciation of capacity, but the consecration of capacity.

(1) Here is your body, with all its vigorous life. It is a part of your religion to fill out your body. It is the temple of God, to be kept clean for His indwelling. Not the ascetic man, but the athletic man is the physical representative of the Christian life. Here is your mind, with all the intellectual pursuits which engross you. Many people suppose that the scholar's life is in antagonism to the interests of religion. But religion comes not to destroy the intellectual life. It wants not an empty mind but a full one. The perils of this age come not from scholars, but from smatterers; not from those who know much, but from those who think they 'know it all.'

(2) Under modern unbelief the life of man daily becomes narrower. The belief in a God and the attendant worship of Him, with all its trust, and hope, and virtue, has occupied a vast space in human life; and when to this we add the kindred ideas of heaven and endless existence, we have a vast world of thought and sentiment, which, when taken away from the heart, must leave life narrow indeed. But thus exactly does the criticism of to-day narrow life and transform it from a stream that widens into an ocean into a little thread which runs between some chemical action and a grave. Modern criticism seems a pursuit of the infinitely little, a

search for the microscopic atom, not only of man's body, but of his virtue and hope. Reason being just as powerful for the Christian's God as against Him, the scales should be easily turned in the Christian's favour by the weight of those positive actions, and duties, and pleasures, and hopes; with which it occupies the soul. It fills the human life to overflowing.

2. Christ came to fulfil the Old Testament. The connexion between the Old Testament and the New is not merely one of type and antitype. The real connexion between them is of a deeper kind, which is expounded in the Sermon on the Mount. The separate commandments in the old law might all be deduced from the one law of love: only they forbade, while love inspires; they prescribed actions, love is an inward principle; they were limited and subject to exception, love is infinite, universal, and eternal. Hence, when Christ proclaimed the absoluteness of the law or spirit of love, He was not destroying the essence of the Mosaic law. He gave free course to the eternal thought of which that law had been the local and temporary expression, so that the living water that was for the healing of the nations, but had been artificially confined for the supposed benefit of the chosen people, might well forth afresh and inexhaustibly, and be found enough for the supply of the whole world.

(1) The first point that will occur to every one is the stress Christ laid on motive and thought, as compared with result and action. He forbade not murder only but anger; not adultery only, but the impure thought. These are, of course, mere illustrations. It is not possible to exaggerate the importance of this complete alteration of the sphere of righteousness from actions to thought, from deeds to disposition; this discovery of a new standard by which to judge oneself. It was a revolution in morals. We may keep all the ten Commandments and a hundred more, and yet be hard, unkind, impure, jealous, mean, selfish, complacent—a Pharisee in fact—without a trace of the Christian character. Christ gave a new and far higher standard, by making the test not our action, but our real selves.

(2) The next point, perhaps, should be given as the lifting of the moral above the ceremonial. The religious Jew at the time of Christ was one who carefully observed the law and its traditional additions, as interpreted by the great Rabbis. These regulations governed conduct in curious detail. They prescribed, for example, with a degree of minuteness almost incredible, how often, and when, and precisely how, vessels and hands were to be washed; when fingers in washing were to be held with the tips up, and when to be held down; and precisely what made persons, or foods, or places unclean, and for how long, and how they were to be purified. Now Christ saw that, however great their value might have been as discipline in the past—and that no one would deny—they had now become relatively unimportant. He saw that they were now

obscuring and misleading men's thoughts of God and righteousness. And He said so. Therefore the religious people thought Him irreligious and a blasphemer, and brought about His death. But from that religious world Christ, and His Apostles after Him, appealed to the revelation of the God of righteousness, even then latent in the heart of the whole world, Jew and Gentile, and He appealed not in vain. *Securus judicat orbis*. We do well to remember that the judgment of the outside world on religion, a rough-and-ready judgment it may be, but just and final, turns on one point only—they judge it by its fruits. 'Does it make men good?' Temples and priests, dignity and wealth, learning and privilege, count for little or nothing in that final court. 'Does your religion make men good? Yes or no.' The world said of early Christian teaching that it made men good, and of Pharisaism that it did not. It is by that test that the world judges the Church to-day.

(3) One other point. Christ showed that the true service of God demands not only our abstaining from doing wrong, in the hope of saving our own souls, but actively in every way doing right. We are answerable for the good we neglect to do, as well as for the evil that we do. In this lies a broad distinction between Christ's teaching and all that went before it. The Old Testament defines duties by 'Thou shalt not.' Christ by 'Thou shalt.' We infringe Old Testament laws when we do things we ought not to have done; we infringe the law of Christ when we leave undone the things that we ought to have done; judgment, condemnation, is prefaced in the Old Testament case by the words 'inasmuch as ye did wrong'; in the New Testament by the words 'inasmuch as ye did not do right.'

This was more than the discovery of a new field for conduct, a new test of rightness. It did for morals what Copernicus and Kepler and Newton combined did for astronomy. It altered the centre, the point of view. It determined the future development of religion. It disclosed the master-principle, the ruling force that gives unity to the whole. That master-principle is that God is our loving Father, and that all we are brethren in Him; and that only by showing love like His can we be true men, true servants and children of God, worthy of the life of our Father in us, and that life is love.

3. If this is a worthy and dependable interpretation of Christ, there should be a growing approximation to Him in the lives of His people. Our influence must be directed, not toward destruction, but fulfilment. For we are here to represent Him, and to carry on His work. That there is much to be destroyed in the lives of those among whom we serve is obvious. But it can only be effected by Christ's own method. What is most needed in those around us is not the destructive word of condemnation, so much as the encouraging spirit of comradeship. The beginnings of goodness, of reverence, and of drawing to God have often been destroyed by the un-Christlikeness of those whose duty it was to mani-

fest His Spirit. On the other hand, the warm sympathy which He ever showed toward even the feeblest desires after God, and which encouraged and stimulated the most unlikely in their endeavours, has often guided and saved despairing hearts when manifested through His followers. And it is for this ministry on the part of us all that these days call. We can do more for those around us in their need, for the Church in her feebleness, and for the nation in its moral want, by our own endeavour to live Christ, than by anything else. Here is service for all who name His Name. There is no worthier aim on the part of those to whom other service is impossible than is expressed by the man who said:

Let me live in a house by the side of the road
Where the race of men go by—
Men that are good, and men that are bad,
As good and as bad as I.
I would not sit in the scorner's seat,
Nor hurl the cynic's ban;
Let me live in a house by the side of the road,
And be friend to man.

Second Sunday in Advent.

'Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'—Mt 20²⁸.

LITERATURE.—W. F. Anderson in *Drew Sermons*, 1910; A. Connell, *The Endless Quest*, 1914; B. Davies, *How to Complete our Lives*, 1916; W. S. Hackett, *The Land of your Sojournings*, 1911; H. P. Hughes, *Ethical Christianity*, 1892; H. P. Liddon, *Advent in St. Paul's*, 1891; J. R. Miller, *The Touch of Christ*, 1917; H. C. G. Moule, *Prayers and Promises*, 1896; W. H. Murray, *The Fruits of the Spirit*, 1879; A. Pym, *Divine Humanity*, 1917; C. J. Ridgeway, *The King and His Kingdom*, 1906; J. Wells, *Christ in the Present Age*, 1903.

'I have heard it said that that faithful servant of God, the late Professor Scholefield, of Cambridge, could never get through the Nicene Creed at his Communion Table in St. Michael's Church without an audible faltering when he said the words, 'Who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven.' Mr. Scholefield's character was the opposite of demonstrative and emotional. His manner, not his heart, was somewhat reserved and cold. But he lived near Christ, and meditated closely and deeply upon redeeming love.'¹

This is one of the most familiar, most wonderful,

¹ Bishop H. C. G. Moule.

most far-reaching statements of that redeeming love.

See how it is linked to the Law and the Prophets. The Psalm says, 'Lo, I come'; the Gospel says, 'I came'; the Epistle repeats the Psalm, 'Lo, I come.' What is the purpose in the foreground of the eternal thought as it is indicated in the Psalm, declared in the Gospel, and explained in the Epistle? Is it to sum up Humanity under a new Head? Is it to 'redeem by Incarnation'? The express purpose is, to do the work which 'sacrifice and offering,' as offered under the Law, could never do. It is that the Incarnate might 'put away sins by the sacrifice of himself.' Such, if the Epistle to the Hebrews is our guide, was the ruling purpose in the divine self-consecration. The Self-Consecrator had in view above all things His death, His sacrifice, His blessed expiatory work. 'He took part of flesh and blood,' with His brethren, 'that by means of death he might destroy him that had the power of death.'

x. Now, first, here is both Humiliation and Exaltation.

(1) It speaks of the pain, and yet joy, of an untold Humiliation; of the Lord's being 'made in all things like unto us, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, to make reconciliation for the sins of his people.' It speaks of His divinely willing consent to take upon Him the sinless limitations of manhood; to experience as Man what was meant by growth; what it was to weep, and to wonder; what it was to say, 'Thy will be done,' not only in the light of the heaven of heavens, but under the olives of Gethsemane; what it was to cry to Him whose will He was eternally content to do, 'Why hast thou forsaken me?' and to commit His out-going human Spirit into His hands in death.

(2) It was because His death had in it elements of self-sacrifice and far-reaching service immeasurably greater than any of which patriots or martyrs are capable, that God has 'highly exalted him,' and given Him 'the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow.' Jesus, once the Carpenter of Nazareth, is King of kings and Lord of lords to-day because His services and His sacrifices are the greatest, that is the kingliest, of all. Even His own position at the summit of the great social hierarchy of His kingdom is not determined by caprice or by favouritism. It is His by merit.

ROBERT SCOTT'S List.

the Very Rev. Professor JAMES COOPER, D.D.

UNION: A Voice from Scotland. 3s. net.

THE SPIRITUAL ISSUES OF THE WAR.

By the Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., D.D. 2s. net.

**NATIONAL CHURCH AND THE
IAL CRISIS.**

By the Rev. F. W. BUSSELL, D.D. 3s. 6d. net.

VISION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

By the Rev. T. J. HARDY, M.A. 4s. 6d. net.

G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh.

SECRET OF THE SEALED BOOK

AND ITS MESSAGE FOR THESE TIMES. 3s. 6d. net.

regnant and instructive commentary on the momentous events of
—The Guardian.

E IN THE WORLD TO COME. 2s. 6d. net.

ospel both timely and valuable, a good news very sorely needed.
The Challenge.

GOSPEL OF HOPE:

A MESSAGE OF COMFORT TO THE SORROWING, WITH PRAYERS
FOR THE DEPARTED. 2s. net.

Complete List of Works by BISHOP WALPOLE free on application.

Handbooks of

Catholic Faith and Practice.

ted by the Rev. W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, D.D.

Each 3s. 6d. net.

MISSIONARY QUESTION.

By the Rev. M. R. NEWBOLT, M.A.

Church Times says: 'Short as this book is, it is quite excellent . . .
a survey of the whole missionary question to day as it affects Angli-
cans. . . it is the work of one who has thought deeply on the subject.'

VIRGIN BIRTH OF OUR LORD.

By the Rev. LEONARD PRESTIGE, M.A.

EPISCOPATE AND THE REFORMATION.

By the Rev. PROFESSOR J. P. WHITNEY, B.D.

book to be read, studied, and discussed by all who really desire the
of the Church and the reunion of Christendom.—The Challenge.

PLACE OF THE LAITY IN THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. N. P. WILLIAMS, M.A., the Rev. W. J.
SPARROW-SIMPSON, D.D., and Others.

unusual interest and importance. . . should be of great value.
English Church Union Gazette.

Full particulars of this NEW LIBRARY, 'HANDBOOKS
OF CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE,' free by post.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

**COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S
FIRST and SECOND EPISTLES
TO THE THESSALONIANS.**

Each 6s. net.

Church Times says: 'Those who know Dr. Plummer's "St.
ew" are already aware of his immense gifts as a commentator—his
earnest, his reverence, his balance, his intuition. These qualities
gain displayed in his exposition of the First Epistle to the
Theslonians. To have it on our shelves will be a permanent gain.'

SEPTUAGINT FALLACY.

AN INDICTMENT OF MODERN CRITICISM.

By the Rev. W. I. PHILLIPS, M.A. Foreword by
PREBENDARY DENISON. 3s. 6d. net.

Churchman says: 'The value of this little book is out of all pro-
portion to its size. Mr. Denison's vigorous attack on German criticism is
lever and cutting.'

alogues of THEOLOGICAL and GENERAL LITERATURE
free on application.

London: ROBERT SCOTT, Publisher,
Batemaster Row, E.C.4.

OLIPHANT'S NEW LIST

The Spirit that Wins

By Major-Chaplain Rev. A. G. MACKINNON
Author of 'The Making of Hector Cameron,' 'Malta,
the Nurse of the Mediterranean,' &c.

Few men have equalled Major Mackinnon's gift of
expression and illustration. His new book gives the
experience of a Chaplain during the Great War. He
combines the qualities of a keen observer and able
Christian thinker.

Made in the Pans

By AMY WILSON CARMICHAEL

Author of 'Things as they are in Southern India,' &c.
With a Foreword by the
BISHOP OF DURHAM

Who says: 'I venture to call it a war-time vol-
ume. . . Many poems are addressed, avowedly,
and with a noble consolatory power to "War
Sorrows," and others are prompted and animated
by the experiences of another war not less formidable,
a war of light with Satanic Darkness. . . The
book is full of quiet places of light and beauty.'

Touching the Coming of the Lord

By C. F. HOGG and W. E. VINE, M.A.

Joint Authors of 'The Epistles of Paul the Apostle
to the Thessalonians, with Notes, Exegetical and
Expository,' &c.

What our Children Should Know

And How we Should Tell Them

BY

J. FLACK, L.R.C.P. and S. Edin. and S. Glos.

Temporary Captain R.A.M.C.

Diploma in Public Health, Manchester

With a Foreword by

Sir ROBERT BADEN POWELL

Who says: 'There is no form of education so
attractive to the young of all ages and all spheres, so
wide in its range, and so big and lasting in its moral,
mental, and physical results as Nature study. It
develops close observation, a keen interest in one's
surroundings, an appreciation of beauty, and a rational
understanding of biology and the sex question, and
above all—the realisation of God the Creator.'

Postman's Knock

Letters and Things for Girls and Boys

By ROY OXENHAM

With 26 clever Illustrations by EDITH HARRIES
and several Poems by JOHN OXENHAM

A book which is sure to be a favourite with girls
and boys, and makes an excellent Christmas gift.

An Alphabet of Stories

By Rev. W. J. MAY

Here is something entirely new and very good
indeed in the way of Sunday reading for young
people. The pages are also brimful of suggestive
hints for speakers, teachers, and parents, who will
themselves greatly enjoy the book.

OLIPHANTS LTD., 75 PRINCES STREET,
EDINBURGH.
21 PATERNOSTER SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.4.

MACMILLAN'S LIST

FOLK-LORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend, and Law.

By Sir J. G. FRAZER, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., Author of 'The Golden Bough,' 'Totemism and Exogamy,' etc. 3 Vols. 8vo, 37s. 6d. net.

The Morning Post.—"Professor Frazer, by his exposition of this new science of the comparative anatomy of the mind, has given us the key to man's mental evolution which may have far-reaching and fruitful consequences to the human race. Darwin brought biology under the illuminating spell of evolution; here a like service has been accomplished in regard to man's moral and intellectual progress."

HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D.:

A Remembrance.

With Portraits. Extra crown 8vo.

[Immediately.]

BELIEF AND CREED:

Being an Examination of Portions of 'The Faith of a Modern Churchman' dealing with the Apostles' Creed.

By FREDERIC HENRY CHASE, D.D., Bishop of Ely. Crown 8vo. [Immediately.]

THE FAITH OF THE APOSTLES' CREED:

An Essay in Adjustment of Belief and Faith.

By J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER, D.D., Lady Margaret Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

RELIGION BEHIND THE FRONT AND AFTER THE WAR.

By the Rev. NEVILLE S. TALBOT, M.C., Author of 'Thoughts on Religion at the Front,' etc. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

The Times.—"A thoughtful little volume."

THE RE-EVANGELISATION OF ENGLAND:

Being Studies in Religious Reconstruction.

By CYRIL HEPHER, Canon of Winchester, Author of 'Fruits of Silence,' etc. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo.

[Immediately.]

THE THREE KINGDOMS:

A Young People's Guide to the Christian Faith.

By the Rev. F. G. GODDARD, M.A., B.D., C.F. With Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

THE RELIGION OF THE BEATITUDES:

A Study of Christ's Teaching based on Addresses delivered at All Hallows, Lombard Street, during Lent, 1917.

By the Rev. MINOS DEVINE, M.A. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

Dr. ALEXANDER WHYTE says: "May your fine book get into the hands of hundreds of reading young men."

INTERCESSION: THE SHARING OF THE CROSS.

By CHARLES GARDNER, MURIEL G. E. HARRIS, ELEANOR McDOUGALL, MICHAEL WOOD, and ANNIE H. SMALL. Crown 8vo, sewed, 2s. net.

THE DIARY OF A CHURCH-COER.

By LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH. Third Impression. With Photogravure Portrait, and a new Preface by the Very-Rev. H. R. GAMBLE, Dean of Exeter. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

By S. RADHAKRISHNAN, Professor of Philosophy, Maharajah's College, Mysore. Crown 8vo, 8s. 6d. net.

The Daily News.—"Few of us have felt the need of such an expository book as 'The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore,' but Professor S. Radhakrishnan has done his work so well that one can read it with great interest. The political part is well worth study now that the League of Nations is on every tongue."

THE ORIGIN OF CONSCIOUSNESS:

An Attempt to conceive the Mind as a Product of Evolution.

By CHARLES AUGUSTUS STRONG, late Professor of Psychology in Columbia University. 8vo, 12s. net.

* Send for Macmillan's New Catalogue of Books for Presentation.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON, W.C. 2.

"A valuable addition to the rich store of Scottish memories, and will be read with eagerness far beyond Scotland."—"Claudius Clear" in *THE BRITISH WEEKLY*.

JOHN BROWN OF HADDINGTON

By ROBERT MACKENZIE, M.A.

12s. net.

"'JOHN BROWN OF HADDINGTON,' by Robert Mackenzie, M.A., is a genuine contribution to religious biography. Mr. Mackenzie has done his work in a valiant, skilful, sympathetic, and painstaking way. Of its kind it is a standard book. It is a permanent memorial of an unforgettably gallant spirit that in the face of all difficulties sent its influence far beyond his own parish and even to the ends of the earth. There was that in John Brown of Haddington which cannot die."—"Claudius Clear" in *The British Weekly*.

"Among the intellectual giants of the 18th century John Brown of Haddington was one of the most illustrious. In his biography of the great divine of the Secession the Rev. Robert Mackenzie does full justice to the many-sided achievements of an inspiring subject. . . . Mr. Mackenzie's volume is a bracing study of the development of a rare life, written with a tender veneration."—*Edinburgh Evening News*.

HODDER & STOUGHTON, Publishers.
LONDON, E.C. 4.

Published by T. & T. CLARK, Edinburgh

NOW READY.

8vo (700 pp.), 15s. net.

AN ENTIRELY NEW EDITION OF

Professor J. MOFFATT'S INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

This great work has been out of print for some time. The new (Third and Revised) Edition contains a large amount of new material, and brings the volume up to date as a work of reference for students of the subject. It is believed that this new enlarged edition will add greatly to the usefulness of the work.

The Athenæum says:—"There is no English book so comprehensive, and the reader will be impressed with the author's learning, lucid style, methodical arrangement and reverent attitude."

Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street

London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, & Co. Ltd.

It is His because He 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

That extraordinarily gifted mystic and poet, William Blake, in his book on Jerusalem has a plate of the Crucifixion. The atmosphere is sombre, save for one thin ray of sunshine that reveals Christ on the Cross, and at the foot of the Cross, not the fainting mother, not the beloved disciple, not the Centurion or Joseph of Arimathea, but a solitary human figure of undistinguishable type, with outstretched arms, gazing upwards to the Christ. It is the very daring of genius, which in the moment of His supreme weakness sets the world with its wistful, passionate gesture of appeal in the presence of the Sufferer. And yet, perhaps, it is neither genius nor daring which accomplished so bold an utterance of sacred art, but simple understanding of our Lord's own mind.

2. Next, here is both Service and Sacrifice.

(1) 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.' Yes, this is the summing up of the life this King came to live among men, and of the way in which He sought to win a Kingdom. It is His own statement of what He came to do, and how He came to do it. 'The Son of man came not to be a master, but to be a servant.' This is true not only of the first beginnings of His reign on earth, when He was the despised and rejected of men, but all through. 'As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.' It is the text which He proclaims in stable and cottage and workshop, in the homes where men live and the streets where they gather, on the Cross of shame on which the King dies and the Throne of glory at the Father's Right Hand on which He is seated, as He still ministers to His people; 'He ever liveth to make intercession for them.'

(2) All true service is sacrifice. It is even vicarious sacrifice. But this is more. Think of a noble-minded Christian mother of a wicked son. She feels his sins more than she could have felt them had they been her own, for her saintliness has given her the deepest moral insight and the keenest sensibility. We cannot gauge the intensity of her pangs of vicarious shame. At last she dies from the very same cause to which many distinguished physicians ascribe the death of Christ—the breaking of the heart under overwhelming spiritual agony. Can we venture to believe that that mother's sufferings are of the same kind as Christ's? We must remember that Scripture does not speak generally of Christ's

sufferings, but specifically of His death. We must then compare the death of the mother with the death of Christ. But the mother is not a sinless sufferer; she is not a voluntary sufferer; she does not foresee and accept her sufferings; she never dreams that her death will have any redemptive virtue whatever; she suffers only for the sin of one, while Christ suffered for the sin of the world. She knows that no mother can by any means redeem her son, nor give to God a ransom for him (Ps 49⁷). She would be shocked if any one were to tell her that by the vicarious merit of her death she would achieve the remission of all her son's sins, and make him a child of God and an heir of glory.

3. It is sacrifice and service both in Life and in Death.

(1) Jesus appeared on earth as One who dared all for His great mission. He dared the annoyance and alienation of relatives and friends; He dared the opposition of the religion of His day; He dared to run counter to the only hopes that seemed to keep some spark of courage alive in His own subject race. He dared to face the gathering hatred and narrowing path that led to rejection and death; He dared the most utter loneliness of spirit, the loneliness that comes when nobody understands. He could say as none else, 'I have trod the wine-press alone.'

(2) He suffered unto death, even the death of the Cross. He gave His strength and energy, every treasure of His personality. For a moment He seemed to surrender that which made all other sacrifices possible, His calm faith in His Father; for what else means the cry, 'Why hast thou forsaken me'?

If, then, He had His strange attraction and compelling power when He walked in lowly fashion as a man, and could only give hints and prophecies of His great mission, what will the result be when the sacrificial element is released and runs out into all His activities? What new meanings are to be compressed within His pity for the hungry, His compassion for the sick, His sympathy for the sinful? What new link is formed with peoples that lie outside the Jewish tradition? Calvary is the convergence and the release of the whole love of God, and we can detect the thrill of glad assurance in the final command, 'Go and preach the gospel to every creature,' for there is no problem to baffle Him, there is no need, personal, social, or racial, which He is not adequate to meet. The Father hath delivered all things into His hands; He will draw all men unto Him.

Third Sunday in Advent.

'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.'—Jn 10¹⁰.

LITERATURE.—N. Butler, in *University of Chicago Sermons*, 1915; J. N. Figgis, *The Fellowship of the Mystery*, 1914; T. Monod, *The Gift and the Life*, 1912; G. H. Morrison, *The Afterglow of God*, 1912; W. C. E. Newbolt, in *The Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd Ser. iv., 1890; J. Ritson, *Life: The Most Wonderful Thing in the World*; J. K. Swinburne, *The Glory of the Life Laid Down*, 1916.

What is the most wonderful thing in the world? Ask one of the peasants of an inland village what is the most wonderful thing he has ever seen. 'A motor car,' is his reply. Then he sees a flying-machine and the motor car takes a second place. But neither a motor car nor a flying-machine is the most wonderful thing in the world. We are apt to be impressed by the big things of the world—the great mountain, the mighty river. But the humblest weed that grows in the garden is more wonderful than the greatest mountain; the tiniest animalcule that disports itself in a drop of water is more marvellous than the mighty river; it has life, and life is the most wonderful thing in the world. This wonderful thing assumes myriads of different forms, but may be seen at its highest in man. Not, however, because he possesses a wonderful physical life, or a still more wonderful intellectual life, but because he may be dowered with a higher life still—life spiritual, life kindred with the life of God. Possessed of this life his manhood is crowned.

This was the great message of the Lord Jesus Christ. Sum up His gospel in a single word, and that one word is Life. Get at the heart of all He had to teach, and life is nestling against that heart. One thought determines every other thought; one fact interprets and arranges everything, and that one fact, so dominant and regal, is the deep fact of life. Deeper than faith, for faith is but a name, unless it issue from a heart that lives; deeper than love, though God Himself be love, for without life love would be impossible. Life is the rich compendium of the gospel, and the sweet epitome of its good news, and the word that gathers into its embrace the music and the ministry of Christ. 'The words that I speak unto you,' He said, 'they are spirit, and they are life.' 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.' 'I am the way, the truth, the life.'

'I am the resurrection and the life.' All that He came to teach—all that He was—is summed and centred in that little word.

1. There are two ways in which men have endeavoured to have abundance of life and to live it. The first is by Self-realization. This method of life dominated Christendom for two hundred and fifty years, even to the middle of the nineteenth century. At first it glorified the Individual. The Perfection of the Individual, this was its goal. This was the watchword of the intellectual and political leaders of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. But it took its rise in the early sixteenth century, in the movement known as the Revival of Learning. At this distance, it looks like an inevitable reaction from the Middle Ages. During that time the individual had little chance from either Church or State. It has even been said that during the Middle Ages Church and State conspired to deprive the individual of his rights. Probably that is not wholly true, if it be interpreted to mean that the leaders of the Church and State, with a perfectly clear conception of what was really due the individual, deliberately planned to defraud him of his rights. No doubt the most sagacious and influential leaders of the time saw clearly how much personal liberty might safely be entrusted to the masses of the people. Yet it seems certain that there was on the part of the leaders in Church and State a good deal of selfish and wicked exploitation of the helpless many by the powerful few. But that was sure to end. Little by little the masses of the people acquired wealth and power and privilege, and at last, after the darkness of ecclesiastical suppression, and after the darkness of political tyranny and oppression, the people threw off the authority of a blind Church leading the blind, and of a selfish nobility knowing no rights but its own desires, and asserted that no one may stand between a man and his God nor between the individual and his rights—and we have the revolution in France, rationalism in England, and in Germany the splendid humanism of Kant and of Goethe, Heine and Schiller. The glory and splendour of life were for every man and woman. This ideal expressed itself, in the realm of culture, in the term 'self-realization'; and in the realm of religion, in the expression 'the salvation of the individual soul.'

2. But this desire for self-realization has proved to be unworkable. Claiming perfect freedom for

the individual, it has landed the individual in selfishness. Not merely Christian morals, but all sense of social discipline is being overruled by the eager self-will of our day and the passion for material enjoyment among the wealthier classes. The desire to escape from the past and to live only in the moment is very imperious, and, with the decay of the sanctions of Puritanism, has become widespread. Poets do but express what is a very prevalent desire in lines such as these of Mr. Sturge-Moore :

Of men the least bound is the roving seaman
Who hires himself to merchantman or pirate
For single voyages, stays where he may please,
Lives his purse empty in a dozen ports,
And ne'er obeys the ghost of what once was !
His laugh chimes readily ; his kiss, no symbol
Of aught to come, but cordial, eager, hot,
Leaves his to-morrow free. With him for comrade
Each day shall be enough, and what is good
Enjoyed, and what is evil borne or cursed.

Fulness of life is impossible except in obedience to the maxim, 'whosoever will lose his life shall save it.' Take the simplest lesson, universally inculcated by the common judgment of mankind, and a prime necessity of physical existence in undeveloped civilizations. Courage in bodily matters, the knightly ideal, means not merely that since pain is inevitable it must be endured, but that literally we are to try to 'grin and bear it.' 'Never,' we are all told, 'can you get the most, the best, out of life, if you will not suffer hardships and face dangers.' In primitive societies this is taught by necessity. In a highly complex civilization some may be artificially sheltered, and of these some, to their undying regret, may escape learning the lesson in youth ; for all that, few will doubt that to make the best of even bodily life some use must be made of the maxim that lies at the root of all Christian discipline. Not merely is no other condition safe ; it is not, in the long run, so full of joy.

The man of the world finds the joy and duty and end of life in its increase of his own resources. The Christian teaching finds that joy and duty and end, not in getting, but in giving life. 'I came,' says Jesus, not to secure more life for myself, but 'that *they* may have life.' 'He that findeth his life shall lose it ; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.' 'Death worketh in us,' says the Apostle Paul, 'but life in you.' The triune formula of joy, duty, and end, according to the Christian teaching, is discovered in the communicative and self-propagating nature of spiritual power. What is the joy of life ? It is the discovery of the capacity

to inspire life. And what is the duty of life ? It is not acquisition, but service. And what is the end of life, or, in the language of the New Testament, its crown ? It is not a crown of gold, or gems, which one may wear on his own head ; it is, as the Book of Revelation says, 'a crown of life,'—the increase of capacity, the enrichment of opportunity, the chance to be of use, the power to say with Jesus Christ : 'I give unto them eternal life.'

3. Now the opportunity of self-denial is found in Social Service. Still holding to the notion that one is to make the most of himself, we come to see that we do and can make the most of this world and of ourselves, not by ourselves, but only in relation to others. Our studies in psychology, history, and the science of society, as well as our practical experience of life, have taught that there is no such thing as an unrelated human being. If you could find an unrelated being, he would not be human. If you deprive a man of human relations, you destroy him. It is a scientific discovery that we live the abundant life not as individuals but in relation to others.

It is never to be forgotten that this social idea of life, so familiar to us, is the Christian idea of life. It is the direct fruit of Christianity and of Christianity alone. Others, no doubt, before Christ had caught the idea, but He alone made it vital. It has pervaded no civilization save Christian civilization. It is the spirit of Christ dominant among men that has, for us, utterly changed the position of woman, the care and education of children, the treatment of criminals, and the care of the insane ; that has brought about the liberation of slaves, the modern organization and administration of charity, the reform of society. To ruin modern life, you have only to take out of it what Christ has contributed to it. The twentieth-century social ideal is the Christian ideal.

4. Thus we return to Christ the Giver of life. And we notice two things.

(1) What He came to give was His own possession. All life comes from antecedent life. Science as yet knows no such thing as spontaneous generation. The inorganic does not become organic till the organic bends down and communicates to it the germs of life. The higher must bend down and touch the lower ere it can possess the potencies of life. That is precisely what Jesus said in regard to the spiritual realm. 'Except a man be born again he cannot enter the Kingdom of God'—the Kingdom of Life. But, thank God, the Higher did condescend to the lower ! 'For God, so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life,' the highest life. Man unregenerate is spiritually dead. All we can say is

that he has the capacity for life. There must be communicated to him the mysterious energy of a new life. He, who is the Life, comes into the soul and endows it with the highest life, and the man becomes in the truest sense a living soul.

(2) This means that Christ is more than an example. The power to live must first oppose itself to those forces of death which make true life so terribly difficult. Man was wounded, humanity was stricken, his heart's blood was ebbing away through the wounds. Jesus Christ had to meet a foe who for centuries had expended his force on human nature. The combat is a long one, the chastisement is severe, He cuts long and deep. 'He restoreth my soul,' again and again by the exercise of His healing blow. But there is more than love and sacrifice here—it is the knowledge of the skilled Physician who goes deeper than the few striking symptoms, and prescribes for something more than the local affection.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.'—Jn 18³⁷.

LITERATURE.—D. G. Burrell, *The Spirit of the Age*, 1895; J. Cuckson, *Faith and Fellowship*, 1897; W. Hornby (ed.), *Teachings of Christ and the Apostles*, 1916; J. B. Johnston, *The Ministry of Reconciliation*, 1875; W. J. Knox Little, *The Witness of the Passion*, 1884; D. M. McIntyre, *Life in His Name*, 1909; N. Porter, *Fifteen Years in the Chapel of Yale College*, 1888.

The annual return of the Festival of Christmas invites us once more to a consideration of the nature and mission of Him whose birth we celebrate. Who was Jesus Christ? The question is not one to which any intelligent man can afford to be indifferent, or to which he has no definite answer, for upon the answer we give to this question depends the quality of our discipleship. Christ is Christianity; and without clear views of His character and person, our moral and religious life must be unstable, as a house that is built upon sand.

In the text we have His own answer. He is a witness, He says. He came into the world to be a witness for the truth. But what is Truth? It is reality as opposed to fallacy or delusion. We must remember that there is a wide difference between truth and veracity: the latter implies a

correspondence between our words and our thoughts, the former between thoughts and facts, realities. Veracity is said to be the virtue of the Anglo-Saxon race, and perhaps justly; but is truth? Jesus came not only to speak the truth, but to be a witness for it, that is to say, to *be* the truth. As He directly said, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life.'

1. He is the truth about God. It is not without deep significance that Christ is thus characterized as the Word. As language is the medium through which we understand one another, so Christ is the articulate speech of God. He is God's Word to men. If we would wish to understand God, we must look on Jesus Christ; on Christ living, dying and triumphing over death. In Him we behold all the divine attributes, and through Him we make the acquaintance of God.

The desire to know God has been, and still is, the most passionate longing of the human race. It is an unsatisfied desire, which grows stronger the more it is fed. Civilization does not outgrow it, and barbarism cannot wholly efface it. It is one of the most urgent and universal of human desires, and in every age of the world men have appeared, who have made the better knowledge and love of God the dominating purpose of their lives. Each generation of prophets has added something higher and better to the thought of God, and with each new revelation has come a purer and loftier service. In Jesus Christ mankind received its perfect and complete unfolding of the divine character. Beyond His thought of the immanent and universal Father we cannot go. That would seem to be the absolute truth and reality of God, which succeeding ages may realize more fully and adequately, but to which they can hardly be expected to add anything. When Philip made his singular request to Jesus, 'Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us,' the answer he received was explicit and final, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

If we ask how He is the truth about God, the answer is:

(1) In His Person. Pascal affirms, with his accustomed sententiousness, that 'too much truth dazzles the mind.' The glory of the invisible God is tempered to our dim sight by the veil of flesh. We gaze with steady eyes on Jesus and behold His glory—glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father.

(2) In His Character. The character of the invisible and omnipresent Deity, whom no eye can fully see, and no life can adequately express, who is without an equal in wisdom and power and goodness, is focused, as it were, in the character of Jesus. And the character of Jesus, as the incomparable revealer of God, is something real, palpable,

apprehensible to us, which does not merely tell us what God is, and what man's idea of Him should be, but puts us in the spiritual presence of the Father, and makes us feel the brightness of His glory and the reality of His life and love.

(3) In His *Knowledge*. His knowledge of God was pure, perfect, immediate. It was too intimate, too direct, too constant, to be described by so tentative a term as 'belief.' He knew God, He did not merely believe in Him. His life was so completely lived in God that the ordinary rational processes, by which men seek to justify to themselves or others a truth of which they are never quite certain, were not necessary in His case. They did not even occur to Him. His life was so unquestionably and completely in accord with God that absolute dependence on His Father, resignation to the divine will, submission to the heavenly purpose, were normal and natural. He did not speculate about God, or shape His trust into definitions and logical statements, but simply revealed the Father, and men felt that His knowledge was intimate and final. His soul was so penetrated, possessed, quickened, by the consciousness of His sonship, that doubt and fear and care and pain did not disturb the calm serenity of His life in God.

2. But in the second place, Christ is the truth about *Man*. Christianity not only furnishes us with the highest and most perfect thought of God and of His providence conceivable, but it also gives us the best idea, whether attained or attainable, of the nature and duty of man. It is unique in its perfect thought of God. It is superlative in its idea of man. Neither science, nor art, nor philosophy, nor poetry, can improve in any degree upon the revelation of Jesus Christ as to the nature and destiny of man. The best history of the world for nearly two thousand years is the story of human effort to grasp that revelation and grow up into it. It is the religion of humanity in a sense in which no other cult can be regarded. Look at mankind from any standpoint that you choose, and there is no other idea that is at all comparable in clearness, fulness, and beauty with the conception of Jesus as to man in his relation to God and to his fellows. It lies at the basis of life in the individual, the family, the Church, and the nation. That God is our Father is the highest thought to which we can hope to attain; and that we are His sons, heirs and joint-heirs with Christ, is a correlative truth not to be surpassed in worth and

significance. Jesus discerned in every soul, even the worst, a God-related element, on the ground of which every sinner under heaven can say, 'I will arise and go to my Father.'

3. In the third place, Christ is the truth about the *Kingdom of God*.

(i) He bore witness to the truth that it was the design of God to establish a kingdom in the hearts of men. In the Old Testament, indeed, the idea of God as a king was often presented, and the minds of the Jews were familiar with it. Accordingly, when John the Baptist appeared, he said, 'The kingdom' (that is, the reign) 'of God is at hand'; but how different was the notion, entertained by the people, regarding the kingdom, from the truth which was taught respecting it by the Saviour! When the multitude, greatly impressed by the miracles which He performed, attempted by force to make Him a King, they thought of such kings as were then, or had been before, in the world. Their notion was that of a king like Herod, or the Roman Cæsars, or—if their thoughts went back, as is not unlikely, to the illustrious times of their own history—a king like David, or Solomon, or Jehoshaphat, or Judas Maccabeus, a king who would aim at worldly conquests, and accomplish his objects by the force of arms. The idea of a spiritual kingdom—of God's reigning in the minds and hearts of men, commanding, rewarding, punishing, securing obedience without carnal weapons—seems never to have entered into their minds.

(2) He bore witness to the truth, that the foundation of this kingdom was to be laid in His own obedience unto death. For a person to die, and especially to die upon a cross, after being tried and condemned as an impostor, a blasphemer, and seditious person, seemed to be the least likely way of obtaining a kingdom, and so thought both the friends and enemies of Jesus. The hearts of the disciples sank when the thought dawned upon them of His dying in pain and infamy; and the chief priests and elders supposed that, by putting Him to death on the cross, they had for ever crushed His claims to be recognized as the Messiah. But His thoughts were not as their thoughts, and His ways were not as their ways. From the very beginning, His soul was, to some extent at least, impressed with the necessity of His dying in the room of men, and of His rising to the throne by the cross. It was at an early period of His

ministry that He spake the mysterious words, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,' and it was at an early period also that, in His conversation with Nicodemus, He said, 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.'

(3) He also bore witness to the truth that faith in His obedience is the essential requisite to the enjoyment of the immunities of His kingdom. By believing a lie man fell, and by believing truth he was to be raised again; by believing Satan's false promises, and disbelieving God's true promises, ruin came upon man, and it was by believing God's true promises, and ceasing to believe Satan's false promises, that eternal life was to be obtained. The fall was by questioning and insulting, and the restoration was to be by admitting and honouring, the veracity of God. As the blessing of pardon was a thing of sovereign goodness—of free and unmerited kindness—God might have given it as He saw fit, but surely there is unspeakable wisdom shown in His giving it in this way, as it is virtually an assertion on the one part, and an acknowledgment on the other, that from the first God had been in the right and man in the wrong.

(4) And He bore witness to the truth, that the immunities of His kingdom were freely offered to men of all countries and times. The Jews were for many centuries separated from the rest of the world, and they imagined that it would always be so. Even the apostles and other early disciples stumbled when Peter preached the gospel to Cornelius, and when Paul proclaimed the breaking down of the 'middle-wall of partition.' Yet in preaching and acting as they did, Peter and Paul were but opening up the great and gracious words of the Master. Did He not say, 'Many shall come from the east and from the west, and the north and the south, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven'? Did He not commend the faith of the Syro-Phenician woman, and tell of the water of life to the woman of Samaria? Did He not say to His disciples, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature'—even that gospel which He Himself preached when He said, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest'; 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink'; 'Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out'?

O Love! O Life! Our faith and sight
Thy presence maketh one:
As through transfigured clouds of white
We trace the noon-day sun.

So, to our mortal eyes subdued,
Flesh-veiled, but not concealed,
We know in Thee the Fatherhood
• And heart of God revealed.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

Christmas 1918.

'He hath put a new song in my mouth.'—Ps 40⁸.

THERE was great news at the breakfast-table the other morning. A wire had come that Charlie was coming home on leave. Katie was very proud of her soldier brother. He was big and strong, and although he kept teasing her all the time she liked it. She had missed him 'ever so much.' And she went off to school singing all the way. I cannot tell you the words of her song; but whatever they were they meant,

'Charlie's coming home; Charlie's coming home.

A new song had been put into Katie's mouth.

1. Thousands of years ago prophets saw empire ruined, and they looked on desolate places where fine cities had been. They knew that all this had happened because the people had forgotten God. Those prophets saw but one little corner of the world. What would they have thought if they had been alive to-day? Well, they thought and prayed, and looked far into the future. 'Away on the horizon,' as we say, some of them saw a new and bright star rising. It appeared to them as a herald of peace to the whole world. They could not help feeling joyful; they could not help singing. Some of their songs are in the Bible; they are very beautiful.

2. But peace did not come so long as those prophets lived. You boys and girls think that the clock of time moves slowly, don't you? From one Christmas to another seems very long. But God's clock moves more slowly still. One of the prophets even became weary from waiting, and cried, 'O Lord, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear.'

The Prince of Peace they had been looking for did come, however.

'What means that star,' the Shepherds said,
'That brightens through the rocky glen?'
And angels, answering overhead,
Sang, 'Peace on earth, good-will to men!'¹

I believe the shepherds sang too; a new song
had been put into their mouths.

3. Christmas bells are ringing once more. You
are glad; we are all glad. But although all these
long years Christian people have sung of peace,
peace as you boys and girls understand it has
never really come. There has been joy because
Jesus Christ was born, but nations have hated one
another, and there have been wars that have
meant suffering, death, and sorrow.

'Tis nineteen hundred years and more
Since those sweet oracles were dumb;
We wait for Him, like them of yore;
Alas, He seems so slow to come!

4. This year the Christmas joy that your fathers
and mothers are feeling is a different joy from
what they have ever felt before. Sadness and
triumph are both in it. They are sad because
they miss young faces from the family table; they
rejoice because they believe that at last they are
within sight of the time when there shall be no
more wars or fighting, and that their brave boys—
your big brothers—have had a share in bringing
about the reign of peace. God has put a
new song in the mouths of your fathers and
mothers.

5. No one has greater reason to sing the new
song than boys and girls. The world in which
peace is to reign is yours. There is a legend that
when Jesus was born the sun danced in the sky,
the aged trees straightened themselves, put on
leaves, and sent forth the fragrance of blossoms.
These are but symbols of what takes place in our
hearts when Christmas comes round. At an
institution for the blind the children had a
Christmas tree given to them. They were very
happy, they shouted for joy, they danced up and
down, and they crowded about and hugged each
other in rapture. They felt like singing a new
song indeed. And in your Christmas joy I hope
you will not forget about the Prince of Peace
promised so long ago. By your loving unselfish-
ness you may play your own little part in starting
the spirit that is to rule the new year.

¹ *The Poetical Works of James Russell Lowell*, 491.

All round about our feet shall shine
A light like that the wise men saw,
If we our loving wills incline
To that sweet Life which is the Law.

So shall we learn to understand
The simple faith of shepherds then,
And, clasping kindly, hand in hand,
Sing, 'Peace on earth, good-will to men!'

And they who do their souls no wrong,
But keep at eve the faith of morn,
Shall daily hear the angel-song,
'To-day the Prince of Peace is born!'²

II.

Gems amid Stones.

'A bag of gems in a heap of stones.'—Pr 26⁸.

That was a queer place for gems, was it not?
You would expect to find them in the treasure-
chamber of a king, or hidden in some safe corner
in a house, or, if you lived in fairyland, you might
search for them in a magic cave. But who would
look for gems in a heap of stones by the roadside?
And yet there they were, all safely tied up in a
bag. Perhaps somebody laid them down and
forgot about them, or perhaps they were hidden in
a hurry, and then their owner died and the secret
of their hiding-place died with him. We do not
know, but there they were, and when I came upon
them in the Book of Proverbs they gave me two
messages for the boys and girls. Would you like
to know these messages?

1. Well, first they told me not to forget to *look
for the gems amid the stones*. What does that
mean? Of course it doesn't mean that you are to
pull down every heap of stones you meet on a
country roadside and that you are to expect to
find a bag of jewels among them. No, it means
that you are to look for beauty among things that
seem plain and ugly; that you are to look for
brightness among things that seem dull or dis-
agreeable; that you are to look for goodness amid
things that seem unattractive or even worthless.

You are to *look for beauty among the things that
seem ugly and plain*. Once a gentleman was
walking on the shores of Westmoreland. He was
accompanied by an old, old man who had lived
there all his days. And as they walked along the

² *The Poetical Works of James Russell Lowell*, 492.

visitor complained of the blackness and ugliness of the beach at that part. But the old man only smiled. 'Have you ever stooped down, sir?' he asked. And when the stranger stooped, he saw that what had before seemed a black mass was crowded with thousands upon thousands of exquisite little shells. Have you found the shells amidst the pebbles, boys and girls? Have you looked for the gems amidst the stones? Have you used the eyes God gave you to discover all the marvels with which He has crowded this wonderful world of His? You are missing some of the best things in life if you have not.

And then you are to *look for brightness among the things that seem dull or disagreeable*. There is a story which tells how two little girls were taken to a strange garden and left there to play. Before long one of them ran to find her mother,—'The garden is a horrid place,' she grumbled, 'every rose-tree has cruel thorns upon it.' By and by the other child came,—'Mother,' she cried, 'the garden is *such* a lovely place; every thorn bush has beautiful roses growing on it.'

Boys and girls, look for the roses among the thorns. Life isn't going to be all fun. Troubles will come as well as joys. The thorns will prick and tear sometimes, and our hands will bleed. But keep a brave heart. There are roses amidst the thorns, and we owe it to ourselves and to those around us to remember the roses. And if we do that, the thorns will seem worth while and the roses will be all the sweeter because of them.

Once more, you are to *look for goodness amidst things that seem unattractive or even worthless*. There are some people we know, about whom there doesn't seem to be anything nice. They are stupid, or dull, or cross, or even unkind and spiteful. There are other people who seem to be out and out bad, and we feel we can't like them however much we try.

Well, remember that somewhere amidst the heap of stones the jewels are shining. Somewhere, perhaps, that unattractive person has a mother who loves him just as much as your mother loves you. The Prodigal Son in the parable did not seem worth much, and yet his father never left off caring for him. And God never leaves off caring for the worst of us. He sees the jewels amidst the stones, and He is able to make them sparkle and glisten in the light of His presence.

So look for the jewels amidst the stones, boys

and girls. There is never a heap of stones without its gem. There is never any one so bad but has some good in him. And if you look for the gem perhaps you will be the means of helping it to shine in the glorious light of day.

2. I have only a minute left for the other message of the jewels, but I must not leave it out. For the second thing they told me was *not to throw away my gems on a heap of stones*. And what does that mean? Well, it just means that you and I are not to throw away things that are valuable on things that are worthless. We are not to waste our energies on trifles; we are not to waste our minds in reading bad books; we are not to waste our friendship on bad companions.

And, boys and girls, there is one priceless jewel you each possess. It is your life here on earth. What are you going to do with it? Are you going to cut it and polish it and make it gloriously worth while? Or are you going to throw it away on a heap of stones? Are you going to make the very best of it so that it may make the world brighter and better? Or are you going to waste it on your own selfish aims or on things that are base and unworthy? The gem is yours, boys and girls, yours to use as you will, but it is yours only once. If you want to guard it safely and use it well, then you must give it into God's keeping. He will watch over it and give it a brighter radiance every day, until at last it is fit to adorn His heavenly crown.

III.

A Good Day.

'A day of gladness and feasting, and a good day, and of sending portions one to another, and gifts to the poor.'—Est 9^{19, 22}.

What do you call a good day? I wonder. Do you ever say to yourself as you snuggle under the blankets at night, 'Well, this has been a good day anyway'? I think I could guess what has made your day a good day. More than likely it has been a day when delightful things have happened to you. Perhaps you have got a present of something you have been longing for, perhaps you have been treated to a circus or a menagerie, perhaps you have made a fine score at cricket, perhaps you have won a prize that you have worked hard to get, perhaps—but there's no need to add more—there are hundreds of jolly

things in the world that may have made it a good day for you.

Why was it a good day for the people in our text? I can tell you. It was a good day because God had delivered them out of terrible danger, and made them victorious over their enemies. If things had gone as they had been planned not one of these people would have been alive on that good day. They would all have been dead on that day before; for that was the danger they had escaped—the danger of losing their lives.

They were Jews—these people—but not Jews living in their own land; they were living in the land of Persia. The king of that land had listened to evil tales which were not true, and had been persuaded by a man called Haman, who hated the Jews, that they were a wicked, troublesome lot, and that the sooner the king got rid of them all the better. The king, unfortunately, was rather a foolish man, who gave orders first and thought afterwards, so he immediately ordered that all the Jews should be put to death on a certain day. It was a large order, and a terrible one too.

But there was one who determined that if she could help it that order should not be carried out. She was a Jewess, and her name was Esther, and she was also the king's wife. He was very fond of her, but he was such a great king that even she dare not approach him until he sent for her. If she went to him without being sent for she risked her life. But Esther thought only of her people and that made her brave, so she went to the king and she showed him how wicked and false Haman's stories had been, and the king repented of the order he had given, and was so angry with Haman that he condemned him to death.

Now the difficulty in Persia was that once a law had been made, it could never be unmade. If the king had once said, 'Kill the Jews,' he couldn't say, 'Do not kill the Jews.' However, the king hit upon a plan. He issued an order that all the Jews should be allowed to defend themselves when attacked; and when the dreaded day arrived the Jews were ready, and instead of being slain, they slew their enemies. Then the day after they rested and feasted and were glad. They made that day a good day, a day of rejoicing, and of sending presents to one another, and of giving

presents to the poor. That is how it was a good day for the Jews.

And it is still a good day for the Jews in every land, for in memory of that great deliverance the Jews still keep what they call the feast of *Purim*. It is a sort of Jewish Christmas day, for, alas! the Jews do not keep Christmas day as we do.

Now I think we might copy these old Jews in their idea of a good day. You see, God first made it a good day for them; and then they made it a good day for others. When God gives us a good day, why should we not pass on some of the goodness to others? Let us give away some of the joy that comes our way. Let us share our happiness. Instead of making us less happy it will make us even happier.

Boys and girls, it is like this. God gives us everything, and we can't show our gratitude to Him in the same way as we can show it to other people. We can't give God something in return. Of course we can give Him our love, and He wants that most of all, but I am speaking rather of some real thing, some token, and we can't give that to God. No, but we can give it to somebody else who needs it, and that is what God wishes us to do. Giving it to that somebody we are really giving it to Him. There are plenty of somebodies who have got neither happy homes, nor jolly presents, nor nice food, nor warm clothing. God loves us to remember these somebodies when the good day comes our way.

I think God would be very pleased if we were all like the little girl I read of the other day. She and her brothers and sisters were promised a monthly allowance of pocket-money. She was a very tiny tot, so her allowance was to be only a halfpenny a month. But a halfpenny seemed a huge sum to the little maid, and she was so overjoyed that she got it changed at once for two farthings. Then she ran through to her father's study, and said, 'Daddy, I'm very rich now, and I'm going to allow you a farthing a month, and here is your December farthing!'

If God gives us the halfpennies, let us try to give away the farthings. If He gives us a good and happy day, let us try to make it a good and happy day for others. If we do that we shall find that it is not only a good, but, what is better, a perfect day.

‘Christ Crucified’ for the Thought and Life of To-day.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

II.

FROM these works we may gather material of value for our own consideration of the subject; the argument as it is presented by Dr. Denney may be followed, with such references to the other books as may be helpful. (i.) The two characteristics of the Modern Spirit mentioned by Dr. Smith—the historical criticism of the Holy Scriptures, and the principle of the Solidarity of the Race with its corollary, the law of Heredity—are undoubtedly important. Of the first Dr. Smith himself does not make an altogether consistent use; if he had he would not have included the so-called *Protevangeli-um* of Gn 3¹⁵ and the passage about the prophet in Dt 18¹⁵ as two instances of Messianic prophecy; nor would he have given the kinds of Hebrew sacrifice in the order in which he has done. It is the merit of Mr. Mozley’s book that he discusses all the Biblical questions, taking full account of all that modern scholarship has to say about them. Dr. Denney does not expressly discuss these questions, but his treatment rests on the historical criticism of the Holy Scriptures. I am not at all inclined to attach as much significance to the bearing of the modern theory of heredity on the Pauline doctrine of imputation as does Dr. Smith, and we need hardly now, except as a matter of historical interest, trouble ourselves much about the distinction between ‘immediate,’ and ‘mediate’ imputation, or the federal theology. It is doubtful whether heredity in the strict sense as physical, has the moral significance which is often attached to it. It is much more probable that what has been called *social heredity*—the inheritance of customs, standards, institutions—is a very much more potent factor in human development for good or evil. Ritschl’s theory of a kingdom of sin opposed to the kingdom of God is a very much more useful conception. Dr. Smith’s use of the law of heredity assumes a fall of the race; and he attempts to harmonize Scripture and science by showing that a fall of man, not from perfection, but from innocence, is not inconsistent with the doctrine of evolution. Dr. Denney is

content to start from the present fact of man’s sense of sinfulness. ‘It is not necessary,’ he says, ‘in this connection to speculate either on the origin of evil or on a primitive state of man’ (p. 189). If we must speculate as to man’s moral history, it would seem to me more in accord with the facts to assume a condition morally neutral, with possibilities both of good and of evil, in which the wrong and not the right direction in development was taken, but not to the suppression of the possibilities of good in opposition to and conflict with the possibilities of evil. Dr. Denney in his discussion of the need as well as the value of reconciliation is entirely in accord with the modern spirit, as his method is psychological and ethical, in one word experimental. ‘It is a commonplace of modern theology that no doctrine has any value except as it is based on experience, and before proceeding to the Christian doctrine of reconciliation, it is indispensable to look at the experience or experiences which are covered by the term’ (pp. 7–8). In his first chapter he seeks also to relate the distinctive Christian experience to experience generally. ‘Reconciliation is a term of wide scope and various application, and it is hardly possible to conceive a life or a religion which should dispense with it’ (p. 1). But experience is not self-sufficient, it must be expressive of something. ‘The *differentia* of Christian reconciliation is that it is inseparable from Christ; it is dependent on Him and mediated through Him’ (p. 8). He does not, however, distinguish, as some writers do, between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. ‘The historical Christ does not belong to the past. The living Spirit of God makes Him present and eternal’ (p. 9). That this method has close affinities with the Ritschlian hardly needs pointing out, and thoroughly experimental and historical is his analysis of the reconciling action of Christ on men. While insisting on the central significance of the death, he keeps it in organic relation to the whole life.

(ii.) While for his own purpose Dr. Denney wa

justified in omitting any special discussion of the Old Testament doctrine, and there is force in the reason that he gives for that omission, which has already been quoted, yet it would be a loss if his action were treated as a general precedent. The Old Testament has value in this as in other doctrines as preparatory for the New Testament. The doctrine of sacrifice, especially in the light of the comparative study of religions, while it does not explain the sacrifice, yet relates the sacrifice to a world-wide movement of the spirit of man, in which we may surely discern the guidance of the Spirit of God. It is a real *preparatio evangelica*. Dr. Smith and Mr. Mozley both devote some attention to the subject; but the treatment of the latter is more adequate. In reference to the Atonement it does not seem necessary to refer to the Messianic hope as a whole, as Jesus certainly did not fulfil the prophetic predictions regarding the King of the house of David, unless in so far as the conflict between the ideals of Jesus and the popular expectations of the Messiah was the historical condition of His rejection. So unique, however, is the significance of the ideal of the Servant of Yahveh, that it should not be presented as it is by Dr. Smith as only one form of the Messianic hope. Mr. Mozley's treatment may be especially commended, as he shows how in this ideal the priestly and the prophetic types of teaching converge. There can be no doubt, as Dr. Denney recognizes, that it was this ideal which Jesus set before Himself, even from His baptism. He did not simply fall back upon it when His attempt to realize another ideal of the Messiahship failed. We need not in this connexion assume any supernatural foresight, but only the moral and religious insight of the Son, leading Him to choose the one rather than the other of the two ideals presented to His consciousness, when His call came.

(iii.) Dr. Smith is not altogether just to the Patristic period when he selects as its sole solution of the problem of the Atonement *the ransom theory*. It is not as adequately representative of that period as are the *satisfaction theory* and the *forensic theory* of the Mediæval and Post-Reformation periods respectively. The characteristic doctrine of the Greek fathers is represented by Athanasius, of whose book on the Incarnation Dr. Denney gives a full account. 'The incarnation means for him that the eternal Word assumed flesh in the womb

of the Virgin; in doing so, He united the human nature to the divine, and in principle the atonement, or the reconciliation of humanity to God, was accomplished.' His attitude to this theory is not sympathetic. 'Now, be the speculative fascination as great as it may, this is not a position in which a Christian mind can rest content' (p. 37). While the inadequacy of the doctrine may be fully admitted, and even the injury it did to subsequent Christian thought by diverting attention to the metaphysical from the ethical and the spiritual, yet Dr. Denney seems to me to fail to do justice to the truth which it enshrines. Man is not merely sinner, and God's relation to man is not limited to His dealing with human sin; and without regarding the Incarnation as itself the Atonement, we must not assume that it has no significance apart from the Atonement, as showing the close affinity and community between God and man. Consistently with his general position, Dr. Denney rejects the view that Atonement must not be regarded as the sole reason for the Incarnation, that even to a sinless race, the Son of God might have come. 'Attractive as it may appear to speculative minds, the idea that Christ would have come apart from this redemptive purpose—to complete creation or give humanity a Head—departs from the line of religious and especially of Christian interest. It finds the motive of the incarnation in some speculative or metaphysical fitness, and not where Scripture and experience put it, in love' (p. 59). While we may agree with him that we have to interpret the world as it is, and not imagine what it might be; yet, on the other hand, he is not just to this idea, for in it too the motive for incarnation might be love. God might love a sinless soul and seek closer fellowship with it in Himself becoming man. This is an instance of a defect which meets us again and again in this great book. The author is not always wide enough in his sympathy to appreciate modes of thought and types of experience which are not his own. The tone of the volume is very much more gracious than that in former books, and yet again and again is the author not entirely just to views he does not share, and seemingly cannot even understand as representing any moral and spiritual reality for others. It is, however, a perilous enterprise for any man, however great his personality—and Dr. Denney's was great—to make himself the measure of all truth.

(iv.) As might be anticipated, Dr. Denney does full justice to Augustine. He recognizes that Augustine's chief concern was not that of evangelical Protestant theology, as for instance Luther's. 'It was not responsibility, or the bad conscience attending on sin, which mainly troubled him; it was the bondage of the will, intensified, as he came to believe, into a corruption of the whole nature' (p. 52). Anselm also is very sympathetically handled, as he is by Dr. Smith; but both fully point out the defects of his theory. We may ask whether Dr. Denney recognizes adequately the reflex action of terminology on thought, of the intellectual environment on even a great mind in such a sentence in defence of Anselm as this: 'It is absurd to say that Anselm, or those to whom his thoughts appealed, conceived of God as a feudal baron and not as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (p. 67). The significance of the application of the term *satisfactio* to the work of Christ with its close association with the penitential system of the Church is fully recognized. Of special value in Principal Franks' work is the full treatment he gives to this association in dealing with the mediæval theology. The change brought about at the Reformation is stated by Dr. Denney in one sentence. 'The satisfaction of which the theologians think is not the Anselmic one, which has no relation to punishment, nor that of the penitential system, which is only quasi-penal, but that of Roman law, which is identical with punishment' (p. 94). 'What measure of truth there was in the Socinian criticism of the Reformation doctrine is fully acknowledged. What now may seem only a theological subtlety—the distinction between the active and the passive obedience of Christ—is shown to be an endeavour to correct the one-sidedness of this penal theory, that 'it left no significance for salvation to anything in Jesus except His death' (p. 94). Another defect of the doctrine of reconciliation, that it had become 'too objective,' and needed to be brought into closer relation to human experience, is indicated. In Grotius' theory it is held 'there is something arbitrary in the death of Christ, something which takes us out of the region of rational and moral necessities where alone the mind can breathe' (p. 113). As regards the last century and a quarter, Dr. Denney says that 'it does no injustice to other theologians if we say that the original contributions which have been made to the subject are

represented in Schleiermacher's *Der Christliche Glaube* (1821), McLeod Campbell's *The Nature of the Atonement* (1856), and Ritschl's *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (1870-74)' (p. 115). The common merit he finds in these books is that as regards both Christ Himself and the believer 'personality gets the place, or something like the place, which is its due' (p. 119).

(v.) It is from this standpoint that the New Testament Doctrine is treated. While Dr. Denney's theory of the atonement rests on Paul's teaching, yet Paul is interpreted experimentally not dogmatically; and what is a special merit, and redeems the whole discussion from the one-sidedness which sometimes results from too narrow a Pauline basis, the testimony of the Gospels has full justice done to it. We approach the Cross as it ought to be approached, by the way of the earthly life, and especially Jesus' dealing with sinners. There are many beautiful and gracious passages it would be a delight to quote, did limits of space allow. But we must press on to deal with the constructive discussion. With all that Dr. Denney says about the need of reconciliation I find myself in substantial agreement. His searching analysis of sin and its consequences, of the divine reaction against sin in the moral order of the world, of the wrath of God and death as it is for moral beings as divine judgment on sin carries conviction to my conscience no less than my reason. No theory of the atonement can be adequate which does not recognize the stern and sad realities here described with sanity of thought and sobriety of language. What alone can meet this great need is reconciliation; and 'in the last resort, nothing reconciles but love; and what the soul needs, which has been alienated from God by sin, and is suffering under the divine reaction against it, is the manifestation of a love which can assure it that neither the sin itself nor the soul's condemnation of it, nor even the divine reaction against it culminating in death, is the last reality in the universe; the last reality is rather love itself, making our sin its own in all its reality, submitting as one with us to all the divine reactions against it, and loving us to the end through it, and in spite of it. Reconciliation is achieved where such a love is manifested, and when in spite of guilt, distrust, and fear it wins the confidence of the sinful' (p. 218). There is no antithesis here between the love and the righteousness of God

which, however effective rhetorically, is only disastrous theologically.

(vi.) While Dr. Smith insists that in view of New Testament usage we must not think of the reconciliation as mutual, since God as Father needs not to be reconciled to men, but only men to God, Dr. Denney adequately explains the New Testament usage as emphasizing God's initiative in reconciliation, and to my mind convincingly shows how the New Testament teaching on the wrath of God and the reaction of God in the moral order of the world against sin justifies us in maintaining that reconciliation is mutual. 'When we say that because God is love . . . therefore He does not need to be and cannot be reconciled, we are imparting immutability to God in a sense which practically denies that He is the living God. . . . He has experiences in His love. To have His love wounded by sin is one, and to forgive sin is another. If to be forgiven is a real experience, so is to forgive; it makes a difference to God as well as to us,' (p. 237). Dr. Smith rejects the interpretation of the term *propitiation* in what he calls the forensic sense. He regards it as in the Septuagint equivalent entirely to the Hebrew *Kipper*, 'wipe out' or 'purge away,' which it is used to translate, and maintains that in the apostolic writings 'the pagan idea of "propitiation" in the sense of appeasing an angry God is excluded,' and that the "propitiation" is never wrought by the penitent upon God; it is wrought by God upon the penitent's sin. It signifies not the sinner's placation of God, the appeasement of His anger, the satisfaction of His justice, but God's forgiveness and purgation of the sinner's guilt' (p. 163). He recognizes vicarious sacrifice as a necessity of God's Fatherhood, but insists that the satisfaction is not of justice, but of love. Nevertheless he holds that the necessity of an atoning sacrifice rests on the satisfaction of man's moral instincts. 'His sin had to be adequately dealt with. It demanded expia-

tion; and expiation means open confession and full reparation.' 'It is primarily a human necessity. It is indeed a divine necessity also; not because God's justice demands satisfaction or because His wrath must be appeased, but because Love is vicarious and the sin of His children lays a burden of sorrow on the Father's heart' (p. 178). When a theologian uses such a phrase as 'moral instincts,' I become at once suspicious that he has not thought out his problem, and does not know how to make his view intelligible. There may be moral intentions, but these are not moral instincts: the term is quite inappropriate. Again, we are back to all the vain antitheses between justice and wrath on the one hand, and love on the other, for love can and must be just, and love can and must be angry with what threatens to sever the bonds of fellowship. But if God and man have moral affinity and community, man's moral intuitions will not be other than what the moral character of God Himself is. I entirely agree with Dr. Denney's statement: 'What pursues man in his sin and appeals to him is not love which is thinking of nothing but man, and is ready to ignore and to defy everything for his sake; it is a love which in Christ before everything does homage to that in God which sin has defied. No other love, and no love acting otherwise, can reconcile the sinner to a God whose inexorable repulsion of sin is witnessed to in conscience and in the whole reaction of the world's order against evil. We cannot dispense with the ideas of propitiation, *ελασμός, ἱλαστήριον*; we cannot dispense with a work of reconciliation which is as objective as Christ Himself, and has its independent objective value to God, let our estimate of it be what it will' (p. 236). It is possible to think of the holy love of God as propitiated, morally satisfied by the sacrifice of Christ without introducing any false pagan notions of an angry God appeased.

Contributions and Comments.

Leaven.

How did the Israelites renew their leaven after each Passover, when it had all been destroyed more than a week before (Ex 12¹⁵ 13⁷, etc.)? Some commentators tell us much about the care for its complete destruction shown by modern Jews. There was no 'brewer's yeast'—and 'must' from the new vintage would not be available for some time—old dough (unbaked) was, of course, destroyed.

Perhaps some student of the Talmud, or some theologian who is also a chemist, may throw light on the problem. Even if new dough developed the bacteria after a while, it would take time, and undesirable bacterial and chemical changes would be as likely to take place.

GEORGE FARMER.

Wellesley House, Walmer.

John vi. 29.

'Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.'

It is interesting and instructive to compare these words with the statement in Gn 2¹⁵.

In the far-off days of prehistoric times, before Man had discovered how to record his thoughts, in those days when folk-lore sought to convey spiritual and moral truths in picture stories of metaphor, allegory, and simile, the fathers told the children that the first Man—the first Adam—was given work to do, when he was placed in the paradise (Persian for 'park') of the Eden, or plain, of the Tigris-Euphrates valley. Man was not to be idle. He was to 'dress and to keep' that creation which God had given over to him for his use and his enjoyment: manual work, or the use and exercise of the powers of the body.

As Man realized a relationship with 'his Creator, or the obligation of some 'attitude' towards Him, his *work* began to include religious ceremonies, thought to be pleasing to the Most High. We find these developed and applied to many departments of life in that which, amongst the Jews—a nation of religious geniuses—came to be termed The Law. It was an advance: because Man had come to realize that his activities were not to minister to the needs of Man only; but also to minister to the glory of his Creator.

Christ made the highest appeal possible to Man. He was to ally himself definitely with God by the exercise of his spiritual power—faith. St. Paul has aptly explained this by remarking that we are (called to be) 'fellow-workers with God.' Christ

said of *Himself*, 'I do the works of him that sent me.' No thoughtful Christian confuses the virtue (or spiritual power) called faith—for the exercise of which Christ appealed—with a formula of intellectual assent: yet agnostics and sceptics delight in gibing Christians with professing a faith which is nothing more than a belief in fanciful statements about events which never occurred. And, in controversy, the Romanists never tire of asserting that the reformed churches are new churches, because they have changed their 'belief.' It is deplorable that, in arguing the point, the latter should be allowed to obscure the spirit. We need some great teacher who shall call Christendom to consider afresh the statement of Jn 6²⁹. *Christians, are those who respond to the call to do that greatest of all works—to exercise the spiritual power of faith, the power of ranging themselves on God's side, implicitly trusting Him and persistently seeking the guidance of His Holy Spirit.* This is done by acknowledging Christ, accepting Him as the Word Incarnate, and spiritually assimilating Him.

The early Christians realized the importance of this 'work of God,' and St. Paul, in writing to the Romans and to the Galatians, argues the necessity of (the work of) faith, as distinct from works of The Law, or ordinary 'good' works, not performed 'by the finger of God.' St. James steps in to prevent that misconception of faith which would confuse it with spiritual idleness—a life of contemplation apart from the world in which we live. He shows that faith, being an active power, or a spiritual work, must show results: the results are inseparable from the exercise of the power. His Epistle is anything but 'an epistle of straw.'

In the life of Christ upon Earth, it is noticeable that, in His works of healing, He demanded the co-operation of faith. The person could not be a beneficiary unless he, or she, became 'a fellow-worker with God' by the exercise of the virtue of faith. Where the exercise of this virtue was not to be found, He could do no works of power. And, in one striking instance, *the sufferer realized that his faith was ineffectual without the co-operation of Christ: 'If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.'* To this appeal Christ responded.

That this power of faith—or co-operation with God—has unlimited possibilities is shown by Christ's simple assertion that the exercise of the power could remove a mountain—because the power is that power by which the mountain was brought into existence. To take the remark as hyperbole is, surely, to rob faith of its power.

WALTER G. WHITE.

Georgetown, British Guiana.

Entre Nous.

WHAT THEY SAY.

NOTHING touches people so nearly as reality, and there is nothing about which opinions are more confidently bandied than about the nature of what is real.¹

'You,' Bismarck said to the Poles, 'will never realise your ambitions except as the result of a war, disastrous to Germany, when Prussia has been smashed to pieces.'²

Bismarck might be satisfied with his power to convert. He, too, now opened his Bible and read Ps 9³⁻⁵, which greatly comforted him. Yet he also wrote with perfect sincerity: 'We have good confidence, but we must not forget that Almighty God is very capricious (*sehr launenhaft*).'³

Bismarck undertook the apparently impossible task of convincing his sovereign and countrymen that in 1864, 1866, and in 1870 they were fighting, not an aggressive, but a defensive, war. Neither Moltke nor he himself believed that—quite the contrary. But it was essential that the King and Prussia—the professors, the lawyers, the bourgeois at his desk and the peasant in the fields—should believe it. And they did—in the end.⁴

I believe we all really admit in our hearts that a great part of the best practical Christianity of our country is to be found among the Nonconformists, and that there is no word which requires more careful and charitable application than the word 'schism.'⁵

The religious situation, then, is something of this kind. The 'shaking' of established institutions and established ideas which the world-wide convulsion of the war has brought about has generated and produced into the light not only a great deal of criticism, shallow and profound, of existing religious institutions and creeds, but also a widespread positive aspiration, which is vocal and intelligible, towards the restoration into prominent emphasis of the two most fundamental and original elements of the Christian Creed—the Lordship of

Jesus and the Mission of the Spirit to constitute the visible Christian Church His Spirit-bearing body—His organ and instrument for self-expression and action in the world.⁶

The story of the elder brother has often been treated as if it were for all practical purposes a new parable. Surely this is to misread it. The younger son has had his gay time in the far country; and when times change for the worse all he has to do is to make for home, where he will be received with open arms and every mark of distinction, with never a word of the shameful past. We do not find it so in life. The conversation between the father and the elder brother is not a superfluous addition to the story, but a second and integral chapter. The elder brother wants to know, as we all want to know, whether after all the younger son has had the best of it. And the father says 'No.' The prodigal returns indeed, but he does not return as he went. His share of the parental estate, youth, health, reputation, purity, all are gone; and he has a new inheritance of a load of bitter memories. Long weary years of patient uphill work will not bring him back to a position quite like that which he destroyed in a few reckless months.⁷

CERTAIN TOPICS:

The Paradise of the Apocalypses.

Over against these pictures of vengeance, we find in the Apocalypses a presentation of the joys that await the righteous. This side of their message contains many beautiful and tender sayings, and is almost as vivid as the other, as lavish in imagery, as fertile in fancy. The pictures of future blessedness are as emphatic and unrelieved as the pictures of perdition. As the wicked have no light in their darkness, so the righteous have no shadows in their light. They are perfectly victorious, happy and strong; they dwell in a new world with God and His Anointed; are clothed with light as with a garment and walk in eternal goodness and truth. They are satisfied with the likeness of the Lord, and reap in perpetual harvest the fruits of all their sorrow.

¹ A. McDowall, *Realism*, 2.

² C. G. Robertson, *Bismarck*, 389.

³ *Ibid.* 204.

⁴ *Ibid.* 170.

⁵ Bishop Gore, *Dominant Ideas*, 35.

⁶ *Ibid.* 114.

⁷ Professor J. E. McFadyen in *Jesus and Life*, 34.

'On the heights of that world shall they dwell,
And they shall be made like unto the angels,
And be made equal to the stars;
And they shall be changed into every form they
desire,
From beauty into loveliness,
And from light into the splendour of glory.'¹

A Revival.

When I left London for America in 1904 there was a religious revival at work in Wales which was unlike any other movement of the kind, both in its method and its quality. It was not organized, it had no outstanding preacher, it was scarcely directed; it was in the strict sense of the word a movement, a mysterious stirring of the depths, a spreading wave, a swelling and rush of spiritual tides that swept through the entire Principality. I remember an agnostic journalist telling me that no sooner did he reach Wales than there fell on him a curious awe. He had intended to write a cynical article for his newspaper—all his articles were cynical—but he was overwhelmed by the sense of a spiritual power which he could not comprehend. He came back to London with his article unwritten. 'I feel,' he said, 'as though I had seen God.'²

Blood and Iron.

On 29th September 1863, Bismarck gave expression in debate to the famous sentence: 'Germany has its eyes not on Prussia's Liberalism, but on its might. . . . Prussia must reserve its strength for the favourable moment, which has already more than once been missed. The great questions of the day will not be decided by speeches and resolutions of majorities—that was the blunder of 1848 and 1849—but by blood and iron.' Spoken with calm conviction, that phrase burst like a shell in a powder magazine. It roused a hurricane of indignation through Germany. No such language had been heard from a Prussian Minister since 1815, and if men needed convincing that the Landtag was confronted with the Junker of 1849, the proof was surely there from the Minister-President's own lips.³

A Nation's Conscience.

The Polish rebellion of January 1863 precipitated a European crisis. The sympathy of Western and Central Europe, alike in the governments and their people, with the Polish effort to secure national

unity and administrative autonomy—freedom as a race from Russian tyranny—is very remarkable and profoundly significant of the grip of Liberal and Nationalist ideals on the temper of the age. In London, Paris, Turin, and Vienna, the Polish cause was acclaimed with enthusiasm. The Poles were fighting for the inalienable right of a nation to work out its salvation and establish its civilization as a self-governing unit in the fraternity of European National-States. The disintegrated Germany of the Federal Bund and denationalized Austria were no whit behind the new Italy, France, and Great Britain in their Polish sympathies. The contrast, indeed, is striking between the manifestation in 1863 of public opinion in Prussia and non-Prussian Germany, in support of the Poles, and in sincere reprobation of the terrible severity with which the defeated rising was crushed by the Russian autocracy, and the cold-blooded equanimity with which Germany and the Magyarized Dual Empire of 1876 and 1896 condoned, when they did not positively approve, the more terrible treatment of the Balkan Slavs and the Armenians by the Ottoman autocracy. Only by such a contrast can we realize the strength of the Liberal movement and of the moral forces behind it, with which Bismarck wrestled in 1863, and register in 1896 the atrophy of a nation's conscience and the withering of its ideals, when for two generations it has been drugged by the doctrine that the great questions of the day can be decided only by blood and iron.⁴

The Demand of Religion.

Out of the mighty struggle of life there has developed in man, among other things, a tremendous capacity for endurance, heroism and courage—all the qualities which go to make up the fighting capabilities of man. But of late years, at any rate, religion has made little, if any, demand upon these qualities. Instead of offering men a challenge that will thrill every drop of blood within them, it has sought to commend itself to them as an almost certain road to prosperity and happiness, its aim apparently being to make its appeal as easy and attractive as possible.⁵

⁴ *Ibid.* 137.

⁵ E. H. Reeman, *Do We Need a New Idea of God?* 117.

¹ J. H. Leckie, *The World to Come and Final Destiny*, 11.

² W. J. Dawson, *The Father of a Soldier*, 112.

³ C. G. Robertson, *Bismarck*, 122.

Pelmanism and Individuality.

BY CORPORAL ARTHUR F. THORN, AUTHOR OF 'RICHARD JEFFERIES AND CIVILISATION,'
'SOCIAL SATIRES,' ETC.

It is an unfortunate fact that the average untrained mind is not easily accessible to ideas. It does not realize that ideas, either good or bad, shape those conditions of society which eventually lift the individual above or press him down beneath the surface of life and opportunity. The faculty of thought—that mysterious gift which differentiates man from the animals, and affords him power over his destiny—has never yet been adequately considered by the people. They do not, for example, perceive that thought, and the ideas which are the natural product of thought, create, sustain, and develop the material conditions of life which surround them in the form of environment.

The average untrained mind does not relate the fact of thought to the facts of material conditions for the very good reason that it does not properly understand the function and power of thought. It would not in any way be an extreme statement to make that more than half the tragedy of human life occurs simply because people do not understand the function and possibilities of thought. But, without being unduly optimistic, it is more than probable that humanity is about to enter into a phase of social life which will insist more and more that the people shall be provided with every possible opportunity of developing their latent mind and brain power. In the strenuous future that lies before the world, virile brains will count as never before in the history of mankind.

At one time, not so very far behind us, the people were not considered to be capable of thinking! They were specially created by an all-wise providence in order to carry out the designs and schemes of that select and inclusive few who alone possessed the faculty of thought. The people, it was said, were destined by Nature to be controlled and exploited by the mental aristocrats; to be used up mainly for the benefit and advantage of others. That, roughly, was the position a generation or two ago.

Since that time, however, the ideals and ideas of

a few great men and women have changed and confounded the pernicious doctrine which refused to recognize the fact of Universal Mind. The democratic educational idea which conceives that every individual's mind and brain is a sacred and divine gift which must be allowed freedom and opportunity to expand and unfold, materialized in the form of a system of popular State-subsidized education for the people, and opened up enormous possibilities for educational development. This system, faulty as it undoubtedly is in its working, does, nevertheless, express the now generally accepted idea that every individual possesses a mind and brain which is entitled at least to respect. In the light of history this idea represents a very remarkable advance, and is nothing less than the triumph of a great ideal.

Progress, we may agree, is a slow and oftentimes uncertain affair, but there can be no question whatever as to the beneficial idea contained in the principle of education for all, both rich and poor. The final achievement that remains to be accomplished in order to derive a full benefit from this idea is the perfecting of the methods of education in order to ensure that the precious quality of individuality shall not be damaged and made to suffer unnecessarily in consequence of a defective system. We must not spoil the exception for the sake of the rule. We must not, for instance, direct a mind which possesses musical genius into a groove which is calculated to help a lawyer mind, or an architect mind. We must not side-track any particular natural talent into a channel which will most certainly retard its progress and rob it of early recognition and success. This is the paramount problem for the teacher in the immediate future.

The dawn of a new educational era is undoubtedly predicted and assured by the growing success of Pelmanism. This system known as 'Pelmanism' is not an academic and conventional system; it does not teach a person History,

DEC 19 1920

A Divine Character Sketch;

by

The Rev. Dr. J. C. Massee

DEC 19 1920

R. J. C. MASSEE, pastor of the Baptist Temple, preached on "Blessed Man—a Divine Character Sketch; Lights and Shadows of Character In Contrast." He said:

The First Psalm is perhaps fundamentally Messianic in its character. The Blessed Man in His perfect apportionment and presentation is doubtless the One Man who spake as never man spake because He lived as never man lived, who was separate from sinners, undefiled and incorruptible. His is the one life of perfect fellowship with God and perfect obedience to God. All His contacts with sinful men were such as He assumed voluntarily and vicariously. Living, He became the chum of sinners, that "being all things to all men, He might by all means win some." Dying, He became sin on behalf of sinners that they might become the righteousness of God in Him. Rising from the dead, He became Life-giver to sinners, that through Him who was dead, who became alive forevermore, they might live also. Because He lives, the believing sinner lives. Ascending into heaven, He ever lives as an advocate of sinners, making intercession for them according to the will of God. Thus all His contacts with sin bear this singular difference from all other human contacts with sin, that He was ever the giver of health, the contagion of His holiness affecting man Godward, whereas His righteousness was never affected adversely by the sinfulness of men whose lives He touched. He is the spiritual ocean whose depths are capable of receiving the whole current of human life, at once settling the debris of its sin and purifying the flow of its energies. His is, indeed, the pattern life in perfect consonance with the character of God and providing a perfect ideal for man.

But the Psalm is not only Messianic in character; it is a human interest Psalm as well. What the Divine Man is in Himself, He produces in those who are bound to Him by a living faith. Thus "the blessed man" will readily appear to be any man whose life is identified with the Divine Master.

That life will be definitely, distinctly, almost violently, set in contrast to the wicked, that is, to the man who has not identified his life with the Lord of life. The effect of this Psalm is to set two men before us in sharp spiritual contrast; the one as foil to the other. The worthlessness of the one enhances the worth of the other. The course pursued by the one sharply accentuates the opposite course pursued by the other.

Everything that one is the other is not; the habits, associations, ideals, standards, activities of these two men are all in utter and constant contrast. They face opposite ways; they move in opposite directions; their whole concept of life is utterly divergent. There is no harmony; it is impossible for them to catch step; wherever they come in contact there is discord; they are separated by their convictions, by their preferences, by the source from which they draw life, by the ideals they seek to incorporate into life, by the plans according to which they build life's structure. They start from a different premise; the one builds on a foundation of rock, the other on a foundation of sand. The horizon of the one is a time horizon; the horizon of the other is as limitless as eternity. The light of the one is darkness; the darkness of the other is light, radiant with the Divine presence and the promise of a perfect day.

These two men are familiar figures in any community. We all know them. As each is presented in the Psalm we find ourselves saying, "That is Mr. So-and-So, a good man, faithful, circumspect, prudent, upright, chaste, an ideal character, after whom the youth of his community may well pattern their lives. He is as a shadow of a great rock in a weary land; behind his strength lesser men take refuge. His great shoulders are reared against the drift of custom, the beating of sin, the blight of tradition. Men who have not dared in themselves to face opposition, to endure hardness, to struggle against the evil, gather strength and courage and catch a vision from the shadow of his example. He stands out as a man whose counsel is wise, whose judgment is discerning and discriminating and true, who builds constructively in all the affairs that affect human life, and the community rejoices in him and counts him one of its most treasured possessions."

Equally truly is the other recognized as he is set forth: a man whose life is fruitless and frivolous and foolish. We say, "That is Mr. So-and-So."

We often wonder at the lack of purpose in his life; the pitiable weakness that leads him to yield constantly to the baser things; to embody the low conception; to fall of the heavenly ideal. Youth touches his life but he is blighted. When he departs from life, the community draws a sigh of relief, even while it breathes a word of pity, "Poor fellow, he is gone." He has left no lasting monument; he has built no enduring structure; he has contributed no permanent values to his day or generation. It is true, he has seemed to have a good time, he has perhaps prospered materially, he has been able to swim strongly against the social tides. There have been bonds in his life and no pains in death. But you know him to be chaff before the wind; that his life is but for the day in which it is spent, that when he passes it will be a permanent void. He leaves behind him no trail of hopes and influences, no heritage of real life values. The two, each in his own way, challenge the community. The young are often made to wonder about them. Why are they so different?

Which now is the happy man? What is to be the end of all for each? Who is the worthy pattern? Whose influence shall win the admiration, determine the judgments, become the pattern for the community? These are each old questions, universal problems, and there is a universal answer. God gives it. It is here in the First Psalm.

We are told at the start that the happy man is the good man. The divine wisdom contravenes always the foolish wisdom of this world. The world through its wisdom has not been able to know God. Neither has it been able to discern truth concerning its own best interests. It generally makes self-indulgence its path to happiness; appetite the language of contentment. The careless man plants his life in the soil of worldliness and flowers forth many a gay color. There is a grace and charm and winsomeness about him that appeals to the thoughtless. What a strange obsession has taken hold of the world! Worldliness is happiness! That is the way of pleasure! No, God's wisdom enters explicit denial of the philosophy of life. He tells us that the way of the transgressor is hell. The path of sin always bruises the feet, not to say the heart, of those who walk in it. The atmosphere around that path is miasmic. It seems to glow a bit brighter in lights, more surely does death dwell in its shadows. It is the path of

righteous that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. "Wisdom's way are the ways of pleasantness and her paths are peace."

DEC 19 1920

Life is never stagnant. Life moves; one great imperative is forward: there is no stopping. Always faith is being held upon us with an irresistible impulse toward the mountains, or the lack of it is seizing us with the irresistible gravitation to the plains. We cannot escape the one or the other. To live is to grow in one direction. Moral neutrality is a real impossibility. Tendencies from within and forces from without draw irresistibly every human being toward the goal of life or the goal of death. Wherever man is, there is a struggle between the forces of evil and of righteousness. There is a gravitation toward earthliness, there is a devotion toward heaven. In human existence, there is an undertow of sin all along the shore of life. Man may go by easy, almost imperceptible, stages from the mount of vision to the valley of spiritual death. Certain it is that if he tumbles out of the valley to the mount, top it is at the expense of struggle and resolution and endurance and persistent perseverance against all odds and many oppositions. It is well to remind ourselves that the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea are in the same valley. The waters that flow out of the one flow into the other, but the one sea teems with life and the other is death.

So this Psalm thrusts upon us the consideration of life's progressions. As he moves on, he walks with the ungodly, he stands with sinners, he sits on the seat of the scoffing. Or, he refuses this progression of evil and walks with the righteous and stands with the disciples and sits with the saints in the worship of the living God.

He is in a bad way who begins to disregard his mother's counsel, to despise her tears and refuse her prayers. Directly, he will be standing in the counsel of the wicked and inevitably will come to ridicule her faith. He discredits virtue, he betrays truth, he becomes the tutor of evil for youth, the purveyor of obscenity, the huckster of moral uncleanness, the sorriest spectacle upon which life's sun rises and sheds its light.

Maybe it is a young girl, who goes unchallenged thereto by the vague desire to go with the fast set. Directly she has standing in that set. She becomes the unknown woman of the secret intrigues, with publicity given to her exploits, withheld for a time from her name. She will be the Jezebel of the painted cheeks who forgets how to blush. She will be the advance guard of the stronghold of evil, asserting masculine privileges of smoking in hotels, and drinking cocktails with male companions, of telling shady stories and being free and easy with men. These are the stages by which she comes to the bartering of her virtue for the privilege of dipping her hand in the carnally savory flesh pots of Egypt. And when she has sold her virtue, she will directly also scoff at the virtue of others and then openly discredit the very existence of virtue. She lives toward pleasure and is dead while she lives.

It may be that the feet that take hold on the downward path are those of the minister. Time was when his heart burned with evangelical fervor, when the glow of love and devotion set his whole life aflame, when it was easy for him to believe in the Divine Presence and the Divine Power; when miracles were everywhere. But one day he listened to the siren voice that persuaded him to believe that knowledge was better than faith. Directly at the bidding of science (falsely so-called) he began to question the testimony of his faith and from having miracles everywhere, he began to deny miracles anywhere. From being a man of the Old Book, he became a man demanding of the new century a new book. For the old faith he substituted modernism. From the passion of zeal and love which once consumed him he shrinks away, ashamed now of any enthusiasm, and manifests to his pitying fellows the hopeless spectacle of the lukewarmness, the coldness that can only result in the fearful doom of being spewed out by the Master whom he has betrayed. Let the souls of men flee from the path that leads down. Trust not its easy stages. Take no other step in the light of its "will-of-the-wisp" of worldly wisdom.

What manner of man would you be? Blessed? Happy? Then delight yourself in the Lord and in His law day and night. Make His Word the man of your counsel, a lamp to your path, the guide of your life. Plant the roots of your life hard by the rivers of water that flow forth from the smitten rock. Lay hold upon eternal life. Build its qualities into your character, absorb its strength for your faculties, employ its energies in your activities. This is the life that endures. You may measure your fitness for life's conflicts, your ability to endure life's struggles and the happiness of your life's end by your delight in the law of the Lord and in the character and constancy of your meditation upon His Word. One of old said, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet." So he found the sure way of life. And "Thy word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee." So he made his life's way the highway of holiness. And the Word of God stands fast, so life's anchor holds for the godly man and he fears not the storm nor the raging sea. Circumstances and conditions move him not. The Lord knoweth the righteous and having committed his ways unto the Lord, he rests in the living and daily security that the Lord will bring to pass his desire.

Paul, making his conflict and continuing from the hour of his first burst of faith in obedience to the heavenly vision which on the way to Damascus dawned upon his soul, closed his career with this exultant shout, "I have fought the good fight. I have kept the faith. The time of my departure is at hand. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of rejoicing which the righteous judge will give unto me at the last day. Not unto me only but unto all them that love His appearing."

